

On the Zappa-Szép Product¹

MATTHEW G. BRIN

March 3, 2003

1. INTRODUCTION

The semidirect product of two groups is a natural generalization of the direct product of two groups in that the requirement that both factors be normal in the product is replaced by the weaker requirement that only one of the factors be normal in the product. The Zappa-Szép product of two groups is a natural generalization of the semidirect product of two groups in that neither factor is required to be normal.

The Zappa-Szép product was developed by G. Zappa in [16]. Variations and generalizations were studied in the setting of groups by Rédei in [11] and Casadio in [3]. The products were used to discover properties of groups by Rédei, Szép and Tibiletti in numerous papers. Szép independently discovered the relations of the product and used them to study structural properties of groups (e.g., normal subgroups [13]) and also initiated the study of similar products in settings other than groups in [14] and [15]. The terminology *Zappa-Szép product* was suggested by Zappa. See also Page 674 of [8].

For the last several years, the author has been investigating and extending a family of closely related groups known as Thompson's groups. See [2] for background on these groups. It was found that the structure of these groups as groups of fractions of monoids that in most cases were Zappa-Szép products of simpler monoids was the key to successful analysis.

The author's investigations were motivated in the first place by an intimate relationship that Thompson's groups have with certain categories. The intimate relationship is helped by the fact that the Zappa-Szép product works fantastically well with categories. The (partial) multiplication on a category is the composition of its morphisms.

It turns out that the Zappa-Szép product has the remarkable property that it seems to require no hypotheses at all. Group-like properties such as associativity, fullness of the multiplication, identities, and inverses can be assumed or removed at random and the Zappa-Szép product can still be discussed and used at some level.

This paper records the author's observations on the Zappa-Szép product that are needed for his investigations. Properties needed to work with categories, monoids, and groups of fractions of monoids include associativity, existence of certain identities and inverses, cancellativity, and the existence of common right multiples. The behavior of the Zappa-Szép product in connection with these properties is studied in this paper. Definitions for these properties and the property in the next paragraph are given in the next section.

Thompson's groups are unusual in that they have strong finiteness properties (most are finitely presented) and some interesting geometric properties. The finiteness and geometric properties include the ability to act nicely on certain "non-positively curved" metric spaces and spaces that are finite in each dimension modulo the action. Crucial to the construction of these spaces is the existence of least

¹AMS Classification (2000): primary 20N02, secondary 20L05, 20M10

common left multiples in the generating monoids. Thus the behavior of the Zappa-Szép product in regards to presentations and least common left multiples is also studied in this paper.

Some of this paper is expository. The Zappa-Szép product is “done over” from scratch in excruciating generality. It is hoped that the increased generality and the previously unexplored behavior of the Zappa-Szép product with respect to certain aspects of algebraic structures will be of interest to others.

The next section reviews all of the terms used in the paper. It is a long section since the behavior of the Zappa-Szép product is studied with respect to several properties and constructs. The section after that defines the Zappa-Szép product and studies its properties.

The author would like to thank B. Brewster, D. Karagueuzian, J. Szép, and G. Zappa for helpful comments and communications.

2. BASICS AND DEFINITIONS

We use a large number of structures in this paper. This purpose of this section is to establish terminology. We work with presentations of semigroups, monoids and groups and we write out carefully what is meant in each case. A technique involving confluent and terminating relations is a powerful tool that we use, and we write out most of its details.

2.1. Sets with multiplication. A triple (A, D, m) is a *set with partial multiplication* if A is a set, $D \subseteq A \times A$ and $m : D \rightarrow A$ is a function. There are no other restrictions. We write ab for $m(a, b)$. We call D the *domain of the multiplication* and also regard it as a relation on A . We write aDb if (a, b) is in D and we will often say that ab *exists* if aDb . The morphisms of a (small) category form a set with a partial multiplication where the multiplication is composition.

A *homomorphism of sets with partial multiplication* $f : (A, D, m) \rightarrow (B, E, n)$ is a function $f : A \rightarrow B$ so that $f(D) \subseteq E$ and for all $(a, b) \in D$ we have $f(ab) = f(a)f(b)$.

If (A, D, m) is a set with a partial multiplication and $B \subseteq A$, then we say that B is *closed* under the multiplication if $b_1b_2 \in B$ for every $(b_1, b_2) \in D \cap (B \times B)$.

2.2. Multiplication properties. Let (A, D, m) be a set with a partial multiplication. We say that the partial multiplication is *right associative* if aDb and $(ab)Dc$ together imply that bDc and $aD(bc)$ hold and $(ab)c = a(bc)$. The multiplication is *left associative* if bDc and $aD(bc)$ together imply that aDb and $(ab)Dc$ hold and $(ab)c = a(bc)$. We say that the partial multiplication is *(fully) associative* if it is both left and right associative. The multiplication is *categorical* if it is fully associative and aDb and bDc together imply that $aD(bc)$ and $(ab)Dc$. The multiplication is *full* if $D = A \times A$. The morphisms of a small category under composition form a categorical multiplication which in general is not full.

A set with a full, associative multiplication is a *semigroup*.

Let (A, D, m) be a set with a partial multiplication and let x be in A . A *right identity* for x is an a in A for which xDa and $xa = x$. We define *left identity* for x symmetrically. We say that $a \in A$ is a *right identity* for A if it is a right identity for every x with xDa and there is at least one x with xDa . We define *left identity* for A symmetrically. We say that $a \in A$ is a *full identity* if it is both a right and left identity for A . An element e of a partial multiplication (A, D, m) is a *global*

identity if, for all $a \in A$, we have eDa and aDe and $ae = ea = a$. Identities of various types are far from unique. However, we have the following.

Lemma 2.1. *In a right (left) associative partial multiplication, there can be only one right (left) identity for a given x that is also a full identity.*

Proof. We give the proof using the word “right.” If a and b are right identities for x , then $(xa)b = xb = x$ and right associativity requires that ab must exist. If both a and b are full identities, then ab equals both a and b . $\square$

We say that a set (A, D, m) with partial multiplication has *right (left) identities* if every element has a right (left) identity that is also a right (left) identity for A . This is stronger than requiring that each element has a right (left) identity. We say that a partial multiplication has *full identities* if it has both right and left identities. The next lemma shows that having full identities really means that there are lots of full identities.

Lemma 2.2. *If a set (A, D, m) with partial multiplication has full identities, then each right (left) identity a for A is a full identity for A and satisfies aDa (and is thus an idempotent).*

Proof. It suffices to consider a right identity a for A . There is a left identity b for a that is a left identity for A . Now ba equals both a and b , so a is both a left and a right identity for A . Now that $a = b$, we have aDa and $a^2 = a$. $\square$

Since there are many types of identities, it is clear that we can invent even more types of inverses. We will define exactly one type since it is the only one that we will prove anything about. A set M with partial multiplication has *left inverses with respect to right identities* if there is an x making $xa = b$ whenever b is a right identity for M and ab is defined.

We say that a partial multiplication is *left cancellative* if $ab = ac$ always implies $b = c$, and say it is *right cancellative* if $ac = bc$ always implies that $a = b$. The multiplication is said to be *cancellative* if it is both right and left cancellative. A partial multiplication is *strongly left cancellative* if it is left cancellative and if $ab = a$ implies that b is a global identity. The reader can define strongly right cancellative.

Lemma 2.3. *Let S be a cancellative semigroup. Then (1) S is strongly left cancellative and strongly right cancellative and (2) if S has a global identity 1 , and $ab = 1$, then $ba = 1$.*

Proof. If $ab = a$, then the chain of implications

$$ab = a \Rightarrow abc = ac \Rightarrow bc = c \Rightarrow cbc = cc \Rightarrow cb = c$$

where c is arbitrary shows that b is a global identity. Strong right cancellativity is argued the same way. If $ab = 1$, then $aba = a$ and ba must also be a global identity by strong left cancellativity. $\square$

We say that a is a *unit* in a set M with partial multiplication if there is a b so that both ab and ba are a global identity for M . Of course, this makes b a unit as well.

A *monoid* is a semigroup with a global identity.

Let a and b be elements of a semigroup for which there are p and q so that $ap = bq$. We call $ap = bq$ a *common right multiple* of a and b . A semigroup is

said to have *common right multiples* if every pair of elements has a common right multiple. A symmetric definition gives common left multiples. We asymmetrically define the following. The notion is needed in certain constructions based on the Thompson groups. A semigroup has *least common left multiples* if for every pair a and b with a common left multiple there are p and q so that $pa = qb$ and if m is another common left multiple of a and b , then there is a k so that $m = kpa = kbq$. Note that the definition of least common left multiples is worded so that a semigroup with least common left multiples need not have common left multiples.

If x and y are in a set with multiplication, then a *common left factor* of x and y is an f so that $x = fa$ and $y = fb$ for some a and b .

The next lemma is straightforward.

Lemma 2.4. *Let S be a cancellative semigroup. Then the following hold.*

- (a) *Let l be a least common left multiple of (a, b) . Then l' is a least common left multiple of (a, b) if and only if $l' = ul$ for some unit u of S .*
- (b) *Let (a, b) have a least common left multiple. Then $xa = yb$ is a least common left multiple of (a, b) if and only if all common left factors of (x, y) are units of S .*

2.3. Categories. We use the standard notions of category theory such as can be found in [9].

A *groupoid* is a category in which every morphism is an isomorphism. A groupoid with one object forms a *group* (with the emphasis being on the set of morphisms and its operation of composition). A category with one object forms a *monoid* (with the emphasis being on the set of morphisms and its operation of composition).

A groupoid is *connected* if every pair of objects has a morphism between them.

If G is a groupoid and x is an object of G , then G_x will denote the set of morphisms that have x as both domain and codomain. Composition makes G_x into a group. If G is connected, then all the G_x are isomorphic. However, there is no canonical isomorphism between any two of them.

If G is an arbitrary category, then G_x will still denote the set of morphisms that have x as both domain and codomain, but now G_x is just a monoid. Even if G is connected (again, any two objects have a morphism between them) it is not necessarily the case that all the G_x are isomorphic.

2.4. Relations. Relations are subsets of cross products and as such can be operated on by the usual set operations such as union and intersection. Relations with properties that are preserved under arbitrary intersection (such as equivalence relations) can be generated by (sets of) other relations. Thus we can talk of the equivalence relation generated by one or more relations on a set A as the smallest equivalence relation on A that contains all the given relations. It is the intersection of all the equivalence relations containing the given relations and it is provably the set of all pairs (a, b) for which there is a chain of elements $a = a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k = b$ so that, for $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, one of (a_i, a_{i+1}) or (a_{i+1}, a_i) is in one of the given relations or $a_i = a_{i+1}$. We can also talk about the symmetric closure (smallest containing symmetric relation) or transitive closure, etc., of a set of relations. The equivalence relation generated by a set of relations is the reflexive, symmetric, transitive closure.

The empty relation is allowed, as is the empty function.

If $\rightarrow$ is a binary relation on a set A , then we write $a \rightarrow b$ for $(a, b) \in \rightarrow$. The inverse relation $\leftarrow$ is defined by $(a \leftarrow b) \Leftrightarrow (b \rightarrow a)$. We will often have reason to investigate properties of a relation and its inverse, and it is worth noting that the inverse of a reflexive relation is reflexive, and the inverse of a transitive relation is transitive.

If A has a (partial) multiplication with domain D , then an equivalence relation $\sim$ on A is a *congruence relation* (with respect to the multiplication) if aDb , $a'Db'$, $a \sim a'$ and $b \sim b'$ always implies $(ab) \sim (a'b')$. This is exactly what is needed to induce a (partial) multiplication on the set $A/\sim$ of equivalence classes from the multiplication on A and give a homomorphism from A to $A/\sim$. If A is a group, then an equivalence relation is a congruence relation if and only if the equivalence class N of the identity is a normal subgroup of A and the relation is precisely the relation “belongs to the same coset of N .”

It is convenient to compare relations under containment. If R and S are binary relations on a set A , then $R \subseteq S$ has the same meaning as for all $(a, b) \in A \times A$, aRb implies aSb .

2.5. Distinguished representatives. We now deal with properties of relations that lead easily to distinguished representatives in equivalence classes. This material is covered with varying detail and terminology in [12], [4], [5], [7] and [1]. Our terminology is closest to [7]. We assume a binary relation $\rightarrow$ on a set A and we let $\sim$ be the equivalence relation generated by $\rightarrow$.

We let $\overrightarrow{\rightarrow}$ denote the reflexive closure of $\rightarrow$, we let $\overrightarrow{\rightarrow}^+$ denote the transitive closure of $\rightarrow$, and we let $\overrightarrow{\rightarrow}^*$ denote the reflexive, transitive closure of $\rightarrow$. We use $\overleftarrow{\rightarrow}$, $\overleftarrow{\rightarrow}^+$ and $\overleftarrow{\rightarrow}^*$ for the inverses, respectively, of $\overrightarrow{\rightarrow}$, $\overrightarrow{\rightarrow}^+$ and $\overrightarrow{\rightarrow}^*$.

We use combinations of symbols to represent compositions. For example, $\overleftarrow{\rightarrow}^* \circ \overrightarrow{\rightarrow}^*$ is the relation verbally represented by $a \overleftarrow{\rightarrow}^* \circ \overrightarrow{\rightarrow}^* b$ if and only if there is a $c \in A$ so that $a \overleftarrow{\rightarrow}^* c$ and $c \overrightarrow{\rightarrow}^* b$. We can now define the following properties of $\rightarrow$

- (1) *Church-Rosser*: $\sim \subseteq \overrightarrow{\rightarrow}^* \circ \overleftarrow{\rightarrow}^*$.
- (2) *confluent*: $\overleftarrow{\rightarrow}^* \circ \overrightarrow{\rightarrow}^* \subseteq \overrightarrow{\rightarrow}^* \circ \overleftarrow{\rightarrow}^*$.
- (3) *strongly confluent*: $\leftarrow \circ \rightarrow \subseteq \overrightarrow{\rightarrow}^* \circ \overleftarrow{\rightarrow}^*$.
- (4) *locally confluent*: $\leftarrow \circ \rightarrow \subseteq \overrightarrow{\rightarrow}^* \circ \overleftarrow{\rightarrow}^*$.

The terminology above is not applied uniformly in all references. The implications

$$(3) \Rightarrow (2) \Leftrightarrow (1) \Rightarrow (4)$$

are easy to show. The implication $(4) \Rightarrow (1)$ is false in general (see [1] and [7]) and a condition that makes it true is our next interest.

We say $\rightarrow$ is *terminating* if there is no infinite sequence $(a_0, a_1, \dots)$ with $a_i \rightarrow a_{i+1}$ and $a_i \neq a_{i+1}$ for all $i \geq 0$. If $B \subseteq A$, then a *minimal* element of B is some $b \in B$ so that $a \in B - \{b\}$ implies that $b \rightarrow a$ is false. We say $\rightarrow$ is *well founded* if every non-empty $B \subseteq A$ has a minimal element. A minimal element of A is called *irreducible*. It is easy that $\rightarrow$ is terminating if and only if it is well founded. A subset B of A is *inductive* if for each $a \in A$, we have $a \in B$ whenever $\{x \mid a \rightarrow x, x \neq a\} \subseteq B$. The Principle of Noetherian Induction (see [6]) states: *If $\rightarrow$ is well founded (equivalently, terminating), then any inductive subset of A equals A .* This is seen by noting that the complement of an inductive subset has no minimal element.

Noetherian induction gives a not very hard proof of the following.

Proposition 2.5 ([10]). *For a terminating binary relation $\rightarrow$ on a set A and its generated equivalence relation $\sim$, the following are equivalent.*

- (a) $\rightarrow$ is Church-Rosser.
- (b) $\rightarrow$ is confluent.
- (c) $\rightarrow$ is locally confluent.
- (d) Each equivalence class under $\sim$ contains a unique irreducible element of A .

If (a)–(d) hold, then for $a \in A$ we have $a \xrightarrow{*} a'$ where a' is the unique irreducible in A with $a \sim a'$.

Proofs, modulo Noetherian induction, are given in [12] and [1] and are indicated or given in exercises in [7] and [4].

The relation $\rightarrow$ is called *complete* if it is terminating and satisfies any of (a)–(d) from Proposition 2.5 above. The property (d) above of complete relations will be used repeatedly in this paper.

The practical importance of Proposition 2.5 is the equivalence of (c) and (d) since local confluence will often be easy to verify. In some cases, strong confluence will hold and the easier implication “strong confluence implies confluence” will then apply. However, we will still need terminating to get irreducible elements and the force of Proposition 2.5 will still hold even if its proof can be avoided.

2.6. Presentations. Using congruence relations, we can discuss presentations of semigroups and monoids. We let $\mathbf{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ be the natural numbers where 0 is regarded as the empty set, $1 = \{0\}$, $2 = \{0, 1\}$, and so forth. We let $\mathbf{N}' = \mathbf{N} - \{0\}$. A finite sequence is a function with domain an element of $\mathbf{N}$. The domain 0 gives a zero length sequence (which is equal to the empty function which in turn equals the empty set).

If X is a set, then X^* is the set of finite sequences in X with domain from $\mathbf{N}$, and X^+ is the set of finite sequences with domain from $\mathbf{N}'$. Elements of X^* or X^+ are called *words* in the alphabet X . We have the binary operation of concatenation of finite sequences in which u and v with domains i and j respectively form uv with domain $i + j$ so that $(uv)_m = u_m$ if $m < i$ and v_{m-i} otherwise. This gives X^* an identity element, the unique zero length sequence, which is absent from X^+ . This identity, being the empty set, will be denoted ϕ for now, but might be denoted 1 if appropriate. The need for care will be discussed below.

The set X^* is usually called the *free monoid* on (the alphabet) X , and X^+ is usually called the *free semigroup* on X . It is clear that X^* is a monoid and that X^+ is a semigroup. We will not be too concerned with, and will not review the “free” aspect.

A presentation is a pair, usually written $\langle X \mid R \rangle$ where X is a set and R is a binary relation on either $F = X^*$ or $F = X^+$. The set X is called the generating set and R is called the relation set. If the presentation is that of a monoid, then $F = X^*$ and if the presentation is that of a semigroup, then $F = X^+$. In both cases, F has concatenation as a binary operation.

From R , we build another relation R' on F consisting of all pairs (xuy, xvy) for which all of x , u , v and y are in F and (u, v) is in R , and then let $\sim$ be the equivalence relation generated by R' . It is a triviality that $\sim$ is a congruence relation and we say that the monoid or semigroup $F/\sim$ is the one determined by the presentation.

Note that in a monoid presentation, the class of the empty word will become the global identity of the monoid. Thus if some non-trivial word in the generators is to be the identity of the monoid, then the empty word must appear as one of the components of a pair in the relation set R .

A presentation of a group is a presentation $\langle X \mid R \rangle$ which determines a group by passing through a monoid presentation (never mentioned) that is derived from $\langle X \mid R \rangle$ consisting of $\langle X \cup X' \mid R \cup I \rangle$ where X' is a set disjoint from X with a fixed one-to-one correspondence from X to X' usually written $x \mapsto x^{-1}$ and I is the set of all pairs of the form (xx^{-1}, ϕ) or $(x^{-1}x, \phi)$. It is a straightforward exercise to show that this is equivalent to the usual description of a group presentation.

2.7. Rewriting rules. Note that if the relation R in the above discussion is replaced by its symmetric closure, then the monoid (semigroup, group) determined by the presentation $\langle X \mid R \rangle$ does not change. Thus one can symmetrize R , but the non-symmetric version may be useful in its own right. When the non-symmetric aspects of a relation set R are being emphasized, then the pairs (u, v) in R are usually called *rewriting rules* and are often written as $u \rightarrow v$. Confusingly, the derived relation R' described above is then viewed as an extension of the relation R or $\rightarrow$ and is often denoted also by $\rightarrow$.

We are most interested in completeness. Let $\langle X \mid R \rangle$ be a monoid (semigroup, group) presentation. If the derived relation R' is complete, then we will also say that the original rewriting rules are complete and also that the presentation is complete. From Proposition 2.5, if $\langle X \mid R \rangle$ is a complete presentation, then each element of the presented object has a unique representative that is irreducible (with respect to R'). In this situation we say that the irreducible representative is in *normal form*.

A rather extreme example of a complete presentation of a semigroup S is the presentation $\langle S \mid M \rangle$ where M consists of all the pairs $(s_1s_2 \rightarrow s_3)$ where $s_1s_2 = s_3$ holds in S . In words, the generating set is all of S and the relation set is the multiplication table for S .

The completeness of the presentation is easy. It is obviously terminating since applications of $\rightarrow$ decrease length. Local confluence breaks into two cases, one of which is trivial and the other of which reduces immediately to the associativity of the multiplication.

We need a slight variation for monoids. The identity of a monoid presentation is the empty word ϕ . If we were to use the presentation above for a monoid S with identity 1, we would have $\phi 1 = 1\phi = 1$, but ϕ and 1 would be distinct. For this reason, we let S' denote $S - \{1\}$ for a monoid S with identity 1. Now the monoid S is presented (as a monoid) by $\langle S' \mid M \rangle$ where M is now the multiplication table as given above with all appearances of 1 replaced by ϕ .

A group is a monoid so the above paragraph should apply to groups, but we do not treat group presentations in the same way as monoid presentations. For a group G , the presentation $\langle G \mid M \rangle$ with M the multiplication table as defined for semigroups gives a valid presentation for G . This is because ϕ and the identity 1 for G are provably in the same class.

3. PRODUCTS OF ALGEBRAIC STRUCTURES

3.1. Motivation. The structure of semidirect products is well known. If a group G is a product AB of two subgroups with A normal and $A \cap B = \{1\}$, then conjugation of A by elements of B gives an action of B on A by automorphisms. If, on the other

hand, A and B are groups not known to be subgroups of another group and there is an action of B on A by automorphisms, then a group structure (the semidirect product) on the set $A \times B$ can be defined so that conjugation of $A \times \{1\}$ by elements of $\{1\} \times B$ mirrors the given action.

A similar situation exists even when A is not assumed to be normal. We first look at groups to get the main ingredients. Let G be a group with identity 1, and with subgroups U and A satisfying $U \cap A = \{1\}$ and $G = UA$. Then each $g \in G$ is uniquely expressible as $g = u\alpha$ with $u \in U$ and $\alpha \in A$.

We are now in a position to reverse certain products. With $u \in U$ and $\alpha \in A$, consider $\alpha u \in G$. We must have unique elements $u' \in U$ and $\alpha' \in A$ so that $\alpha u = u'\alpha'$. This defines two functions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u \in A$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u \in U$ that are unique in that they satisfy $\alpha u = (\alpha \cdot u)(\alpha^u)$ for all $u \in U$ and $\alpha \in A$.

3.2. Generalization. In the discussion above, the assumption $U \cap A = \{1\}$ was only used to conclude that each $g \in G$ was uniquely a product of the form ua with $u \in U$ and $a \in A$. We generalize by making this conclusion a hypothesis. We also generalize by removing the requirement that the algebraic structure be a group. The following triviality is worth stating separately since it allows us to make a useful definition.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (M, D, m) be a set with a partial multiplication and let U and A be subsets of M . Assume that every $x \in M$ is uniquely expressible in the form $x = u\alpha$ with $u \in U$ and $\alpha \in A$. Then there are functions $(A \times U) \cap D \rightarrow A$ written $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$, and $(A \times U) \cap D \rightarrow U$ written $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ defined by the property that $\alpha u = (\alpha \cdot u)(\alpha^u)$ whenever αDu .*

In the setting of the above lemma, the functions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ defined on $(A \times U) \cap D$ will be called the *mutual actions defined by the multiplication*. These actions are “internally” generated by the multiplication. We can also impose actions “externally.”

Let (U, D_U, m_U) and (A, D_A, m_A) be sets with partial multiplications and let $H \subseteq A \times U$. Assume there are functions $H \rightarrow A$ written $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $H \rightarrow U$ written $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ defined on H . We will call such functions *mutual actions* defined on H . However, unless the mutual actions possess some useful properties, little can be done. The next lemma establishes some properties of (useful) mutual actions. (Recall that a categorical multiplication is also associative by definition.)

Lemma 3.2. *Let (M, D, m) be a set with a categorical partial multiplication and let U and A be subsets of M that are closed under the multiplication. Assume that every $x \in M$ is uniquely expressible in the form $x = u\alpha$ with $u \in U$ and $\alpha \in A$, and let $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ defined on $(A \times U) \cap D$ be the mutual actions defined by the multiplication. Let α and β come from A and u and v come from U . Then in each of the following, if one side is defined, then the other side is defined and the two sides are equal.*

- (a) $(\alpha\beta) \cdot u = \alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot u).$
- (b) $(\alpha\beta)^u = \alpha^{(\beta \cdot u)}\beta^u.$
- (c) $\alpha \cdot (uv) = (\alpha \cdot u)(\alpha^u \cdot v).$
- (d) $\alpha^{(uv)} = (\alpha^u)^v.$

Proof. If the left side of one of (a) or (b) is defined, then the left side of the other of (a) or (b) is defined and we have the equality $(\alpha\beta)u = ((\alpha\beta) \cdot u)(\alpha\beta)^u$.

But if the left side of one of (a) or (b) is defined, then $\alpha D\beta$ and $(\alpha\beta)Du$ hold. We have the following chain of equalities with each step using right or left associativity or a hypothesis of the lemma as appropriate:

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha\beta)u &= \alpha(\beta u) = \alpha((\beta \cdot u)(\beta^u)) = (\alpha(\beta \cdot u))\beta^u \\ &= ((\alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot u))\alpha^{(\beta \cdot u)})\beta^u = (\alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot u))(\alpha^{(\beta \cdot u)}\beta^u). \end{aligned}$$

In the last expression the left factor lies in U and the right factor lies in A . The equalities in (a) and (b) follow from the uniqueness hypotheses of the lemma.

The rest of the argument is left to the reader. The argument based on the assumption that the right side of one of (a) or (b) is defined will need the fact that the multiplication is categorical. The arguments relating to (c) and (d) are similar to those for (a) and (b). $\square$

Note that the hypotheses of Lemma 3.2 apply non-trivially to the free abelian monoid on two generators, but not to the free abelian semigroup on two generators.

Commuting elements act nicely. The following lemma and corollary are trivial.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume the hypotheses and notation of Lemma 3.2 without assuming that the multiplication is categorical. Assume that $u \in U$ and $\alpha \in A$ commute. Then $\alpha \cdot u = u$ and $\alpha^u = \alpha$.*

Corollary 3.3.1. *Assume the hypotheses and notation of Lemma 3.2 without assuming that the multiplication is categorical. Assume that M has a global identity 1. If $1 \in U$, then for all $\alpha \in A$, we have $\alpha \cdot 1 = 1$ and $\alpha^1 = \alpha$. If $1 \in A$, then for all $u \in U$, we have $1 \cdot u = u$ and $1^u = 1$.*

In the situation described by Lemma 3.2, we will refer to the multiplication on M as the *Zappa-Szép* product of U and A and write it as $U \bowtie A$. Lemma 3.2 only partly justifies this terminology. Lemma 3.9 below finishes the justification. However, this will only give an “internal” product. The situation with the “external” product is more complicated. The next lemma will partially justify some of the assumptions we will make when we define an external version of the product.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume the hypotheses and notation of Lemma 3.2. If for $u \in U$ there is a $\beta \in A$ for which $u\beta$ exists, then there is an $\alpha_u \in A$ that is a left identity for A for which $u = u\alpha_u$. If for $\alpha \in A$ there is a $v \in U$ for which $v\alpha$ exists, then there is a $u_\alpha \in U$ that is a right identity for U for which $\alpha = u_\alpha\alpha$.*

Proof. We must have $u = u_1\alpha_u$ with $u_1 \in U$ and $\alpha_u \in A$. Now $u\beta = (u_1\alpha_u)\beta = u_1(\alpha_u\beta)$ and our assumptions imply $u = u_1$. Thus $u = u_1\alpha_u = u\alpha_u$. Now consider $\alpha \in A$ with $\alpha_u\alpha$ defined. Since the multiplication is categorical, we have that $u(\alpha_u\alpha)$ is defined and equals $(u\alpha_u)\alpha = u\alpha$ by associativity. Again, our assumptions imply that $\alpha_u\alpha = \alpha$. The rest of the argument is similar to what we have given. $\square$

It turns out that an external product based on (externally imposed) mutual actions can be defined in extreme generality. A (poorly behaved) multiplication emerges even if no additional assumptions are made. In general there is not a perfect correspondence between the internal and external products. For one thing, embeddings of the factors might not exist in an external product. Under extra hypotheses, the external product can be made to correspond to an internal product, but this removes considerable useful generality. Even though the internal product is not fully justified, and an external product has not yet been defined, we will refer to the Zappa-Szép product as if it has a definition.

3.3. An example, part I. We give an example that shows the applicability of the Zappa-Szép product to sets with multiplications that are not full. It will be revisited in Section 3.8.

Our binary operations will be compositions on the morphisms of categories. Thus we will treat the symbols that represent the categories as if they primarily represent the collections of morphisms.

We will start with too much generality and reduce it in stages.

The multiplication on the morphisms of a category that is given by the composition is a categorical partial multiplication.² Thus if we have a category G and subcategories U and A so that every morphism in G is uniquely expressible as $u\alpha$ with $u \in U$ and $\alpha \in A$, then we can write $G = U \bowtie A$. This is little more than a repetition of Lemma 3.2.

We now reduce the generality the first time.

Let G be a category and for each object x in G , let U_x be a subgroup of the monoid G_x . Let $\widehat{U}$ denote the totally disconnected groupoid that is the union of all the U_x .

Further assume that there is a subcategory A of G so that every morphism of G is uniquely expressible as $u\alpha$ with $u \in \widehat{U}$ and $\alpha \in A$. From Lemma 3.2, we get the mutual actions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto (\alpha \cdot u) \in \widehat{U}$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto (\alpha^u) \in A$ on a subset of $A \times \widehat{U}$ satisfying the identities as given in that lemma and we can write $G = \widehat{U} \bowtie A$.

We can say more. First we note that for all objects x , we have 1_x in both $\widehat{U}$ and A . Thus all of $(1_x)^u$, $1_x \cdot u$, α^{1_x} and $\alpha \cdot 1_x$ make sense if $u \in U_x$ and α has domain x . We get the following equalities: $(1_x)^u = 1_x$, $1_x \cdot u = u$, $\alpha^{1_x} = \alpha$ and $\alpha \cdot 1_x = 1_y$ where $\alpha : x \rightarrow y$. Thus not all of the actions associated with the identities of G are trivial.

For an α in some G_x , we must have a unique factorization $\alpha = u\beta$ with $\beta \in A_x$ and $u \in U_x$. Thus each G_x is of the form $U_x \bowtie A_x$. Even if G is a connected groupoid there can be significant irregularity. If G is a connected groupoid and A is a connected subgroupoid, then all the G_x are isomorphic and all the A_x are isomorphic. The next paragraph shows that not all the U_x need be isomorphic.

Let G be a connected groupoid, let A be a connected subgroupoid that contains all the objects of G , and for each object x let U_x be a subgroup of G_x so that $G_x = U_x A_x$ and $U_x \cap A_x = \{1_x\}$. Let $\widehat{U}$ denote the totally disconnected groupoid that is the union of all the U_x . We leave it as an exercise for the reader to show that each morphism in G is uniquely expressible as $u\alpha$ with $u \in \widehat{U}$ and $\alpha \in A$. Thus it is easy to build examples by just choosing an appropriate U_x independently for each x . Permutation groups show that this can be done so that not all the U_x are isomorphic. Let S_3 and S_4 be the permutation groups on, respectively, the sets $\{0, 1, 2\}$ and $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ with S_3 viewed as a subgroup of S_4 in the usual way. Then either the Klein four group or the cyclic group of order four can be embedded in S_4 as a complement to S_3 .

If we cut down on the irregularity by assuming that all the U_x are isomorphic, there might still be some irregularity remaining. It is possible to have a group H with subgroups J , K and L so that J and L are isomorphic complements of the subgroup K , but no automorphism of H carries J to L . This can even be done

²Not all categorical multiplications arise in this way. For a categorical multiplication (M, D, m) to arise from a category, it must also have full identities and satisfy the *digraph rule*: aDb , cDb and cDd implies aDd .

with K normal in H . For example, let $H = S_3 \times \mathbf{Z}_2$ where S_3 is the permutation group on three objects, and $\mathbf{Z}_2$ is the cyclic group of order 2. If x is an involution in S_3 (which is necessarily not central), and y is the generator of $\mathbf{Z}_2$, then we can let $K = S_3 \times \{1\}$, $J = \langle (x, y) \rangle$ and $L = \langle (1, y) \rangle$. Now J and L are of order 2, but are not equivalently embedded in H since one is central and the other is not. They are both complements of the normal subgroup K .

Thus in the connected groupoid setting, if all the U_x are required to be isomorphic, the pairs (G_x, U_x) might not be isomorphic as pairs even though all the pairs (G_x, A_x) will be isomorphic as pairs. In spite of this, nice things happen. We now give the final version of our example.

We now return to an arbitrary category G with subcategory A and assume that a fixed group U is given. For each object x in G , let ϕ_x be a monomorphism from U into the monoid G_x with image U_x . Let $\widehat{U}$ denote the totally disconnected groupoid that is the union of all the U_x and assume that every morphism of G is uniquely expressible as $u\alpha$ with $u \in \widehat{U}$ and $\alpha \in A$. As above, we get mutual actions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto (\alpha \cdot u) \in \widehat{U}$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto (\alpha^u) \in A$ on a subset of $A \times \widehat{U}$ and an expression of G as the Zappa-Szép product $G = \widehat{U} \bowtie A$. We also get the facts mentioned above about the behavior of the mutual actions on the identities.

We now extract more information. Since we have $\alpha u = (\alpha \cdot u)(\alpha^u)$ and elements of $\widehat{U}$ have equal domain and codomain, the domain and codomain of α^u are equal to, respectively, the domain and codomain of α . We can now define mutual actions between A and U instead of between A and $\widehat{U}$. Define $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u \in U$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u \in A$ on $A \times U$ as follows.

$$(1) \quad \text{For } \alpha : x \rightarrow y \text{ and } u \in U, \text{ set } \alpha^u = \alpha^{\phi_x(u)} \text{ and } \alpha \cdot u = \phi_y^{-1}(\alpha \cdot (\phi_x(u)))$$

where the functions on $A \times \widehat{U}$ are used where appropriate. These actions are clearly well defined and they are also defined on all of $A \times U$. Note that for $u \in U$, we also have $\alpha^u : x \rightarrow y$ if α goes from x to y .

We leave it as an exercise for the reader to show that these mutual actions on $A \times U$ satisfy the four identities (a)–(d) from Lemma 3.2 and also satisfy the four equalities $1_x \cdot u = u$, $(1_x)^u = 1_x$, $\alpha \cdot 1 = 1$ and $\alpha^1 = \alpha$ as u , α and x run over, respectively, all U , morphisms of A and objects of A . We will see in Section 3.8 that this will allow us to also express G “externally” as $U \bowtie A$. The “twisting” of the actions that allows for lack of normality in the setting of groups is flexible enough in this situation to allow for the inequivalent embeddings of the various U_x in the G_x .

3.4. One parameter families of functions. We list some properties that mutual actions might have and introduce terminology to go with the properties. To keep notation down, we will never refer to these functions with a symbol and will either use $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ or $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ or similar notation to refer to the functions. We will concentrate on the fact that these functions can be viewed as families of functions from a set to itself parametrized over a second set.

A (partial) function $(A \times U) \rightarrow A$ will be referred to as a (partial) *one parameter family* of functions *over the parameter set* U and *base set* A . The family is *partial* if the domain of the function is actually a proper subset of $A \times U$. Otherwise the family is *full*. If the designation full or partial is omitted, then it will either be clear

from the context or irrelevant. In the (partial) function $(A \times U) \rightarrow U$, the set A is the parameter set, and U is the base set.

We will make some definitions for $(A \times U) \rightarrow A$ written as $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$. The reader can make the corresponding definitions for $(A \times U) \rightarrow U$.

The family is a *family of injections* if $\alpha = \beta$ whenever $\alpha^u = \beta^u$. The family is a *family of surjections* if for each $u \in U$ and $\beta \in A$, there is an $\alpha \in A$ so that $\beta = \alpha^u$.

The family is *confluent* if for all $\alpha \in A$ and u and v in U with α^u and α^v defined, there are p and q in U so that $(\alpha^u)^p = (\alpha^v)^q$.

We say that the parametrized family is *multiplicative* if U is a set with a partial multiplication so that uv and $\alpha^{(uv)}$ are defined and $(\alpha^u)^v = \alpha^{(uv)}$ whenever $(\alpha^u)^v$ is defined. If a multiplicative family is over a semigroup, then we can refer to the family as a *semigroup action* where the term is to emphasize that α^1 is not necessarily α even if U is in fact a monoid.

The parametrized family is *trivial* if α^u is always equal to α when defined. This will usually occur when the family is an action and in this case we will say that the action is trivial.

Lemma 3.5. *A full semigroup action over a semigroup with common right multiples is confluent.*

Proof. Let the action be written $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$. Let $up = vq$ be a common right multiple of u and v . Now $(\alpha^u)^p = \alpha^{(up)} = \alpha^{(vq)} = (\alpha^v)^q$. $\square$

A family is *coconfluent* if whenever $\alpha^u = \beta^v$, there are γ , p and q so that $\alpha = \gamma^p$ and $\beta = \gamma^q$. A multiplicative action is *strongly coconfluent* if whenever $\alpha^u = \beta^v$ and u and v have a common left multiple, there are γ , p and q so that $\alpha = \gamma^p$, $\beta = \gamma^q$ and $pu = qv$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $A \times B \rightarrow A$ written $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ be a full, strongly coconfluent multiplicative action. Assume that B is a right cancellative semigroup, assume that $\alpha^u = \beta^v$ and assume that u and v have a least common left multiple $l = au = bv$. Then there is a $\gamma \in A$ so that $\alpha = \gamma^a$ and $\beta = \gamma^b$.*

Proof. A least common left multiple is a common left multiple, so there are δ , p and q so that $pu = qv$ and so that $\alpha = \delta^p$ and $\beta = \delta^q$. Since $l = au = bv$ is a least common left multiple, there exists a k so that $pu = qv = kl = kau = kbv$. By right cancellativity, we have $p = ka$ and $q = kb$. Let $\gamma = \delta^k$. We have $\gamma^a = \delta^{(ka)} = \delta^p = \alpha$ and $\gamma^b = \delta^{(kb)} = \delta^q = \beta$. $\square$

3.5. Building multiplications. We now start the work on reversing Lemma 3.2. We will do so in pieces since the calculations are lengthy and we will need the pieces separated in what we do later. The reader should keep the example in paragraph 3.3 in mind.

Let (U, D_U, m_U) and (A, D_A, m_A) be two sets with partial multiplications. Let H be a subset of $A \times U$ and assume that we have mutual actions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ defined on H . Let E be a subset of $U \times A$.

We now define a partial multiplication $E \times E \rightarrow U \times A$ by

$$(2) \quad (u, \alpha)(v, \beta) = (u(\alpha \cdot v), \alpha^v \beta)$$

by which we mean that the left side is defined if and only if all of $(\alpha, v) \in H$, $(u, \alpha \cdot v) \in D_U$ and $(\alpha^v, \beta) \in D_A$ hold. This partial multiplication is well defined where it is defined. However, this multiplication possesses very few other properties

unless assumptions are made about the mutual actions, the partial multiplications on U and A and the sets H and E . It is not even guaranteed that the image of this multiplication is contained in E . Often, but not always, we will let $E = U \times A$. We list some ingredients from which we can build appropriate assumptions. The identities are the messiest.

- (P1) (a) $(\alpha \cdot u, \alpha^u)$ is in E whenever (α, u) is in H .
- (b) $(u, \alpha) \in E$ and $(v, u) \in D_U$ imply $(vu, \alpha) \in E$.
- (c) $(u, \alpha) \in E$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in D_A$ imply $(u, \alpha\beta) \in E$.
- (P2) (a) $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ is multiplicative: $(\alpha\beta) \cdot u = \alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot u)$.
- (b) $(\alpha\beta)^u = \alpha^{\beta \cdot u} \beta^u$.
- (c) $\alpha \cdot (uv) = (\alpha \cdot u)(\alpha^u \cdot v)$.
- (d) $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ is multiplicative: $\alpha^{uv} = (\alpha^u)^v$.
- (P3) (a) $(\alpha, \beta) \in D_A$ and $(\beta, u) \in H$ imply $(\alpha\beta, u) \in H$.
- (b) $(u, v) \in D_U$ and $(\alpha, u) \in H$ imply $(\alpha, uv) \in H$.
- (P4) (a) $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ is an injective family.
- (b) $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ is an injective family.
- (P5) (a) $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ is a surjective family.
- (b) $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ is a surjective family.
- (P6) $H = A \times U$.
- (P7) (a) $\alpha^u = \alpha$ for every $\alpha \in A$ and right identity u for U .
- (b) $\alpha^u = \alpha$ for every $\alpha \in A$ and left identity u for U .
- (c) $\alpha \cdot u = u$ for every $u \in U$ and right identity α for A .
- (d) $\alpha \cdot u = u$ for every $u \in U$ and left identity α for A .
- (e) If u is a right identity for U , then $(\alpha, u) \in H$ and $\alpha \cdot u$ is a right identity for U for all $\alpha \in A$.
- (f) If α is a left identity for A , then $(\alpha, u) \in H$ and α^u is a left identity for A for all $u \in U$.
- (g) u is a right identity for U whenever $\alpha \cdot u$ is a right identity for U .
- (h) α is a left identity for A whenever α^u is a left identity for A .
- (P8) $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ is strongly coconfluent.

Note that assumptions (P2)(a–d) read the same as the four conclusions of Lemma 3.2.

We can deal with the closure question.

Lemma 3.7. *Let (U, D_U, m_U) and (A, D_A, m_A) be sets with partial multiplications and with mutual actions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ defined on $H \subseteq A \times U$. Put the partial multiplication (2) on $E \subseteq U \times A$. Then the following hold.*

- (i) *If (P1)(a–c) hold, then the multiplication is closed on E .*
- (ii) *If π_U and π_A are the projections of $U \times A$ to U and A , respectively, then the multiplication (2) is defined on all of E if $H \subseteq \pi_A(E) \times \pi_U(E)$.*

Proof. Consider a pair $(u, \alpha), (v, \beta)$ that (2) applies to. Since $(\alpha, v) \in H$, (P1)(a) implies that $(\alpha \cdot v, \alpha^v)$ is in E . Since $(u, \alpha \cdot v) \in D_U$, (P1)(b) implies that $(u(\alpha \cdot v), \alpha^v)$ is in E . Since $(\alpha^v, \beta) \in D_A$, (P1)(c) implies that $(u(\alpha \cdot v), \alpha^v \beta)$ is in E . This proves (i). Item (ii) is trivial. $\square$

From this point, (P1)(a–c) will be included in all hypotheses.

Note that the multiplication (2) is defined on all of E if (P6) holds, and on all of $U \times A$ if $E = U \times A$ and (P6) holds. Note further that (P1)(a–c) hold if $E = U \times A$.

3.6. Associativity. We will assume that pieces of (P2)(a) through (P2)(d) hold for the mutual actions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$. Our assumptions will take the form of identities with implications. For each of the four identities (P2)(a) through (P2)(d), we will get two assumptions so that we end up with eight possible assumptions. The two assumptions obtained from (P2)(a) will be labelled $(a \Rightarrow)$ and $(a \Leftarrow)$ and the other six assumptions will be labelled similarly.

We define these eight assumptions by example and say that $(a \Rightarrow)$ is to mean that if the left side of (P2)(a) and its intermediate products are defined, then the right side of (P2)(a) and all its intermediate products are defined and the equality holds. The other seven assumptions are defined similarly. We will also say, for example, that (P2)(a) is satisfied if both $(a \Rightarrow)$ and $(a \Leftarrow)$ are satisfied.

We have more notation. If there is a partial multiplication on U , then we will write $\rightarrow_U$ to indicate that the multiplication on U is right associative and will write $\leftarrow_U$ if the multiplication is left associative. We now give the lemma.

Lemma 3.8. *Let (U, D_U, m_U) and (A, D_A, m_A) be sets with partial multiplications and with mutual actions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ defined on $H \subseteq A \times U$. Assume (P1)(a-c) and put the partial multiplication (2) on $E \subseteq U \times A$. Then the following hold.*

- (iii) *If U and A are both right associative and $(a \Rightarrow)$, $(b \Rightarrow)$, $(c \Leftarrow)$ and $(d \Leftarrow)$ all hold, then the partial multiplication on $U \times A$ is right associative.*
- (iv) *If U and A are both left associative and $(a \Leftarrow)$, $(b \Leftarrow)$, $(c \Rightarrow)$ and $(d \Rightarrow)$ all hold, then the partial multiplication on $U \times A$ is left associative.*
- (v) *If U and A are both associative and (P2)(a-d) all hold, then the partial multiplication on $U \times A$ is associative.*

Proof. The proof is contained in the following chain of equalities.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
& ((u, \alpha)(v, \beta))(w, \gamma) & (2) \\
(2) & = (u(\alpha \cdot v), \alpha^v \beta)(w, \gamma) & (2) \\
(2) & = ((u(\alpha \cdot v))((\alpha^v \beta) \cdot w), (\alpha^v \beta)^w \gamma) & (a \Leftarrow) \\
(a \Rightarrow) & = ((u(\alpha \cdot v))(\alpha^v \cdot (\beta \cdot w)), (\alpha^v \beta)^w \gamma) & (\leftarrow_U) \\
(\rightarrow_U) & = (u((\alpha \cdot v)(\alpha^v \cdot (\beta \cdot w))), (\alpha^v \beta)^w \gamma) & (c \Rightarrow) \\
(c \Leftarrow) & = (u(\alpha \cdot (v(\beta \cdot w))), (\alpha^v \beta)^w \gamma) & (b \Leftarrow) \\
(b \Rightarrow) & = (u(\alpha \cdot (v(\beta \cdot w))), ((\alpha^v)^{\beta \cdot w} \beta^w) \gamma) & (d \Rightarrow) \\
(d \Leftarrow) & = (u(\alpha \cdot (v(\beta \cdot w))), (\alpha^{v(\beta \cdot w)} \beta^w) \gamma) & (\leftarrow_A) \\
(\rightarrow_A) & = (u(\alpha \cdot (v(\beta \cdot w))), \alpha^{v(\beta \cdot w)} (\beta^w \gamma)) & (2) \\
(2) & = (u, \alpha)(v(\beta \cdot w), \beta^w \gamma) & (2) \\
(2) & = (u, \alpha)((v, \beta)(w, \gamma)) &
\end{array}$$

The notations on the left give justifications for the equalities if they are read from top to bottom, and the notations on the right give justifications for the equalities if they are read from bottom to top. The references to (2) are to the definition of the multiplication. $\square$

3.7. Reconstruction. We can now prove that (2) reproduces multiplications in certain situations.

Lemma 3.9. *Let (M, D, m) be a set with a categorical, partial multiplication and let U and A be subsets of M that are closed under the multiplication. Assume that every $x \in M$ is uniquely expressible in the form $x = u\alpha$ with $u \in U$ and $\alpha \in A$, and let $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ defined on $H = (A \times U) \cap D$ be the mutual actions defined by the multiplication. Use these mutual actions and (2) to build a partial multiplication on $E = D \cap (U \times A)$. Then sending (u, α) in E to $u\alpha$ in M is an isomorphism of partial multiplications.*

Proof. The hypotheses immediately make the function one to one and onto.

Consider two pairs (u, α) and (v, β) in $U \times A$ and assume that $\alpha \cdot v$ and α^v exist. If all six of $uD\alpha$, αDv , $vD\beta$, $uD(\alpha \cdot v)$, $(\alpha \cdot v)D(\alpha^v)$ and $(\alpha^v)D\beta$ hold, then the properities implied by “categorical” give $(u\alpha)D(v\beta)$, $(u(\alpha \cdot v))D((\alpha^v)\beta)$ and

$$(3) \quad (u\alpha)(v\beta) = (u(\alpha \cdot v))((\alpha^v)\beta).$$

Let (u, α) and (v, β) be from E . From the conditions built into (2), the existence of $(u, \alpha)(v, \beta)$ and the categorical assumption lead to all the conditions that imply (3). If $(u\alpha)D(v\beta)$, then the assumptions behind associativity also lead to the conditions that imply (3). Thus the domains of definition of the multiplications on M and E are carried onto one another, and the product itself is preserved. $\square$

We can now make a definition. Assuming the setting, hypotheses and notation of Lemma 3.9, we say that (M, D, m) is the (*internal*) *Zappa-Szép product* of U and A and write $M = U \bowtie A$.

Results are not attractive when one attempts to create an “external” version that corresponds to the internal version. The next lemma is the best that we have been able to do in this direction.

We take hints from Lemmas 3.2, 3.4 and 3.9 and try to find conditions that imply that the product is categorical and that the factors are embedded. The next lemma takes care of these as best we can. First we need two definitions.

Let (U, D_U, m_U) and (A, D_A, m_A) be sets with partial multiplications with mutual actions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ defined on $H \subseteq A \times U$. Let $E \subseteq U \times A$ be given. A pair of functions $i : A \rightarrow U$ and $j : U \rightarrow A$ will be called *embedding functions* if the following properties hold:

$$\begin{aligned} j(U) &\subseteq \{\text{full identities of } A\}, & i(A) &\subseteq \{\text{full identities of } U\}, \\ uD_U v &\Rightarrow j(u) = j(v) = j(uv), & \alpha D_A \beta &\Rightarrow i(\alpha) = i(\beta) = i(\alpha\beta), \\ (u, j(u)) &\in E, & (i(\alpha), \alpha) &\in E, \\ (j(u), u) &\in H, & (\alpha, i(\alpha)) &\in H, \\ j(u) \cdot u &= u, & \alpha \cdot i(\alpha) &= i(\alpha), \\ (j(u))^u &= j(u), & \alpha^{i(\alpha)} &= \alpha, \\ j(u)D_A j(u), & & i(\alpha)D_U i(\alpha), \\ (\alpha, u) \in H &\Rightarrow [i(\alpha)D_U(\alpha \cdot u) \text{ and } \alpha^u D_A j(u)], \\ &\text{and} \\ (u, \alpha) \in E &\Rightarrow [(j(u), i(\alpha)) \in H, j(u) \cdot i(\alpha) = i(\alpha), (j(u))^{i(\alpha)} = j(u), \\ &\quad uD_U i(\alpha) \text{ and } j(u)D_A \alpha]. \end{aligned}$$

The reader should note how much simpler the above assumptions get when A and U are monoids, $E = U \times A$ and $H = A \times U$. This will be formalized below in Lemma 3.13(xv).

Now let $f : U \rightarrow U'$ and $g : A \rightarrow A'$ be functions (we do not need homomorphisms for this) between sets with partial multiplication so that there are mutual actions between U and A defined on $H \subseteq A \times U$ and also mutual actions between U' and A' defined on $H' \subseteq A' \times U'$ (with the usual notations). We say that f and g *preserve the actions* if for all $(\alpha, u) \in H$ we have $(g(\alpha), f(u)) \in H'$, $g(\alpha^u) = (g(\alpha))^{f(u)}$ and $f(\alpha \cdot u) = g(\alpha) \cdot f(u)$.

Lemma 3.10. *Let (U, D_U, m_U) and (A, D_A, m_A) be sets with partial multiplications and with mutual actions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ defined on $H \subseteq A \times U$. Assume (P1)(a-c) and put the partial multiplication (2) on $E \subseteq U \times A$. Then the following hold.*

- (vi) *If $i : A \rightarrow U$ and $j : U \rightarrow A$ are embedding functions, then sending $\alpha \in A$ to $(i(\alpha), \alpha)$ and sending $u \in U$ to $(u, j(u))$ gives homomorphic embeddings from A and U into the partial multiplication that (2) puts on E . Further if the images of A and U under these embeddings are A' and U' , respectively, then each element of E is uniquely expressible as a product of an element of U' followed by an element of A' and if the mutual actions defined by the multiplication on E are placed on A' and U' , then the homomorphic embeddings preserve the actions.*
- (vii) *If U and A are both categorical and (P2)(a-d) and (P3)(a-b) all hold, then (2) makes the partial multiplication on E categorical.*

Proof. We first work on (vi). Sending $\alpha \in A$ to $(i(\alpha), \alpha)$ and sending $u \in U$ to $(u, j(u))$ clearly give embeddings. It follows easily from the (heavy handed) hypotheses that these embeddings are homomorphisms on the domains of the multiplications. If (u, α) is in E , then the equality $(u, j(u))(i(\alpha), \alpha) = (u, \alpha)$ is equally easy to verify. The well definedness of the product implies the uniqueness of the expansion of (u, α) as $(u, j(u))(i(\alpha), \alpha)$. Lastly, if $(\alpha, u) \in H$, then a simple calculation shows that $(i(\alpha), \alpha)(u, j(u)) = (\alpha \cdot u, \alpha^u)$. This shows that the embeddings preserve the mutual actions.

We now work on (vii). From (P2)(a-d) and the associativity of U and A , we know that the partial multiplication on E is associative. If both products $(u, \alpha)(v, \beta)$ and $(v, \beta)(w, \gamma)$ exist with (u, α) , (v, β) and (w, γ) all in E , then we must show that $[(u, \alpha)(v, \beta)](w, \gamma)$ exists. The existence of $(u, \alpha)[(v, \beta)(w, \gamma)]$ will follow from an identical argument.

To show that $[(u, \alpha)(v, \beta)](w, \gamma)$ exists, we must show all three of $(\alpha^v \beta, w) \in H$, $(u(\alpha \cdot v), (\alpha^v \beta) \cdot w) \in D_U$ and $((\alpha^v \beta)^w, \gamma) \in D_A$. From the existence of $(u, \alpha)(v, \beta)$ and $(v, \beta)(w, \gamma)$, we have that both (α, v) and (β, w) are in H , both $(u, \alpha \cdot v)$ and $(v, \beta \cdot w)$ are in D_U and both (α^v, β) and (β^w, γ) are in D_A .

Combining $(\alpha, v) \in H$ with $(v, \beta \cdot w) \in D_U$ with (P3)(b) gives $(\alpha, v(\beta \cdot w)) \in H$. This says that $\alpha \cdot (v(\beta \cdot w))$ exists which implies by (P2)(c $\Rightarrow$) that $\alpha^v \cdot (\beta \cdot w)$ exists and $(\alpha^v, \beta \cdot w)$ is in H . Combining $(\beta, w) \in H$ and $(\alpha^v, \beta \cdot w) \in H$ with (P2)(a $\Leftarrow$) gives $(\alpha^v \beta, w) \in H$ which is the first item we must show.

From (P2)(c $\Rightarrow$) and the existence of $\alpha \cdot (v(\beta \cdot w))$ we also get $(\alpha \cdot v, \alpha^v \cdot (\beta \cdot w)) \in D_U$. Combining this last fact and $(u, \alpha \cdot v) \in D_U$ with (P2)(a $\Leftarrow$) and the assumption that U is categorical gives $(u(\alpha \cdot v), (\alpha^v \beta) \cdot w) \in D_U$ which is the second item we must show.

Combining $(\alpha^v, \beta) \in D_A$ and $(\beta, w) \in H$ with (P3)(a) gives $(\alpha^v \beta, w) \in H$ which in turn implies that $(\alpha^v \beta)^w$ exists. By (P2)(b $\Rightarrow$), $(\alpha^{v(\beta \cdot w)}, \beta^w)$ is in D_A . Combining this last and $(\beta^w, \gamma) \in D_A$ with the assumption that A is categorical gives $(\alpha^{v(\beta \cdot w)} \beta^w, \gamma) \in D_A$. This is equivalent to the last item that we must show by (P2)(b $\Leftarrow$). $\square$

The setting and hypotheses needed in both parts of Lemma 3.10 define the *external Zappa-Szép product* of U and A , also written $U \bowtie A$. It is unsatisfactory in the number of hypotheses needed.

There is no easy “correspondence” between the internal and external Zappa-Szép products. We revisit the example of Section 3.3 to establish such a correspondence in a particular setting.

3.8. The example, part II. Recall the example at the end of Section 3.3. We are given an arbitrary category G , a subcategory A , a fixed group U , and for each object x a monomorphism ϕ_x from U into the monoid G_x with image U_x . We let $\widehat{U}$ be the union of all the U_x and we assume that every morphism of G is uniquely expressible as $u\alpha$ with $u \in \widehat{U}$ and $\alpha \in A$.

We now take note of the mutual actions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ that are defined by (1) in Section 3.3 on all of $H = A \times U$. These mutual actions are defined from the original actions on A and $\widehat{U}$ that are induced from the multiplication on G . The actions on H satisfy

- (1) the four properties P2(a–d) of Lemma 3.2, and
- (2) the equalities $1_x \cdot u = u$, $(1_x)^u = 1_x$, $\alpha \cdot 1 = 1$ and $\alpha^1 = \alpha$, $S(\alpha^u) = S(\alpha)$ and $T(\alpha^u) = T(\alpha)$ as u , α and x run over, respectively, U , morphisms of A and objects of A .

We now let $E = U \times A$, we fix an object x in G , and we define $i(\alpha) = 1 \in U$ and $j(u) = 1_x \in A$. One can verify that all of the hypotheses of Lemma 3.10 are satisfied. Thus we are justified in writing $U \bowtie A$ for the multiplication that (2) puts on $U \times A$.

Lemma 3.9 allows us to conclude that (the multiplicative structure on the morphisms of) G has the structure $\widehat{U} \bowtie A$. We wish to show an isomorphism between $U \bowtie A$ and $\widehat{U} \bowtie A$.

Let u be in U and $\alpha : x \rightarrow y$ be in A . We send (u, α) in $U \bowtie A$ to $(\phi_y(u), \alpha)$ in $\widehat{U} \bowtie A$. In $U \bowtie A$, we have $(u, \alpha)(v, \beta) = (u(\alpha \cdot v), \alpha^v \beta)$ from (2). Since the domain and codomain of α^v are that of α , since U is a group and since $H = A \times U$, we have that $(u, \alpha)(v, \beta)$ exists if and only if $\alpha\beta$ exists in A . Similarly, the images of (u, α) and (v, β) in $\widehat{U} \bowtie A$ have their product exist under exactly the same condition. Thus the mapping preserves the domain of the product.

From the structure of G and the fact that sending $(\phi_y(u), \alpha)$ in $\widehat{U} \bowtie A$ to $\phi_y(u)\alpha$ in G forms the isomorphism between $\widehat{U} \bowtie A$ and G , we get that our mapping is onto. Our mapping is seen one to one by considering the domain and ranges of the images of elements, by noting that every morphism in G is uniquely an allowable composition from $\widehat{U}A$, and from the injectivity of the various ϕ_y .

To see that the mapping preserves products let $\alpha : x \rightarrow y$ and $\beta : z \rightarrow x$, and note that (u, α) and (v, β) in $U \bowtie A$ are sent to $(\phi_y(u), \alpha)$ and $(\phi_x(v), \beta)$, respectively, in $\widehat{U} \bowtie A$. In $U \bowtie A$, the product $(u, \alpha)(v, \beta)$ is evaluated by (2) as $(u(\alpha \cdot v), \alpha^v \beta)$ which by definition equals $(u\phi_y^{-1}(\alpha \cdot \phi_x(v)), \alpha^{\phi_x(v)} \beta)$. This is sent by our mapping

to

$$\begin{aligned} & (\phi_y[u\phi_y^{-1}(\alpha \cdot \phi_x(v))], \alpha^{\phi_x(v)}\beta) \\ &= (\phi_y(u)(\alpha \cdot \phi_x(v)), \alpha^{\phi_x(v)}\beta) \end{aligned}$$

which is the product $(\phi_y(u), \alpha)(\phi_x(v), \beta)$ in $\widehat{U} \bowtie A$.

On the other hand, assume we are given a category A and group U with mutual actions between them defined on $H = A \times U$, written as above and satisfying (1) and (2) above. Then the embedding functions used above allow us to apply Lemma 3.10 and define $U \bowtie A$ on $E = U \times A$. We try to make a category from $U \bowtie A$ by using the objects of A as objects of $U \bowtie A$ and setting $S(u, \alpha) = S(\alpha)$ and $T(u, \alpha) = T(\alpha)$. Since $H = U \times A$, the formula $(u, \alpha)(v, \beta) = (u(\alpha \cdot v), \alpha^v \beta)$ says that $(u, \alpha)(v, \beta)$ exists if and only if $u(\alpha \cdot v)$ exists and $\alpha^v \beta$ exists. Since U is a group, $u(\alpha \cdot v)$ always exists. Now $\alpha^v \beta$ exists if and only if $\alpha \beta$ exists since $S(\alpha^v) = S(\alpha)$ and $T(\alpha^v) = T(\alpha)$. Thus $(u, \alpha)(v, \beta)$ exists if and only if $\alpha \beta$ exists, and elements of $U \bowtie A$ multiply if and only if domain and range match correctly. An easy check shows that $(1, 1_x)$ acts as an identity at x . Our attempt to make $U \bowtie A$ a category is successful.

Now in $U \bowtie A$, the subcategory $\widehat{A} = \{(1, \alpha) \mid \alpha \in A\}$ and subgroupoid $\widehat{U} = \{(u, 1_x) \mid u \in U, x \text{ an object in } A\}$ fit the description of the example of Section 3.3. The argument above shows that the external product $U \bowtie A$ and the internal product $\widehat{U} \bowtie \widehat{A}$ are isomorphic. From this isomorphism and Lemma 3.10(vi), the mutual actions between U and A deduced from those between $\widehat{U}$ and $\widehat{A}$ as in Section 3.3 are the original assumed actions between U and A . We have essentially shown the following.

Lemma 3.11. *Consider the situations described in (I) and (II):*

(I) *A category G and two subcategories A and $\widehat{U}$ are given where each contains all the objects of G and with $\widehat{U}$ a totally disconnected groupoid so that every morphism in G is uniquely expressible as $u\alpha$ with $u \in \widehat{U}$ and $\alpha \in A$. Also a group U is given with, for each object x of G , an isomorphism $\phi_x : U \rightarrow \widehat{U}_x$.*

(II) *A category A and group U are given with mutual actions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ between them defined on $H = A \times U$, satisfying*

- (1) *the four properties P2(a-d) of Lemma 3.2, and*
- (2) *the equalities $1_x \cdot u = u$, $(1_x)^u = 1_x$, $\alpha \cdot 1 = 1$ and $\alpha^1 = \alpha$, $S(\alpha^u) = S(\alpha)$ and $T(\alpha^u) = T(\alpha)$ as u , α and x run over, respectively, U , morphisms of A and objects of A*

to give a multiplicative structure $U \bowtie A$ on all of $U \times A$.

Given Situation (I), the mutual between U and A action defined by (1) in Section 3.3 defines multiplication on all of $U \times A$ that fits the description of Situation (II) so that G is isomorphic to $U \bowtie A$. Given Situation (II), the Zappa-Szép product $U \bowtie A$ is a category fitting Situation (I). The processes for passing between the two situations are inverse to each other.

3.9. Cancellativity and multiples. The next lemma states conclusions that derive properties that have the word “right” in them. We leave it to the reader to supply corresponding statements that have the word “left.” We also leave the proofs to the reader.

Lemma 3.12. *Let (U, D_U, m_U) and (A, D_A, m_A) be sets with partial multiplications and with mutual actions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ defined on $H \subseteq A \times U$. Assume (P1)(a-c) and put the partial multiplication (2) on $E \subseteq U \times A$. Then the following hold.*

- (viii) *If U and A are both right cancellative and (P4)(a) holds, then the partial multiplication on E is right cancellative.*
- (ix) *If U and A both have common right multiples and (P6) and (P5)(a) both hold, then the partial multiplication on E has common right multiples.*
- (x) *If A and U are semigroups and (P2)(a-d) and (P6) hold, then (2) makes E a semigroup.*

3.10. Identities and inverses. Recall that there are many types of identities possible and even more types of inverses. See the definitions before Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2. What is given in the next lemma is not hard to prove. It gives examples of what can be proven. From Lemma 2.1 we know that some simplification occurs when associativity is present, and from Lemma 2.2 we know that the left/right distinction for identities disappears in a set with a partial multiplication if there are full identities present.

Recall that a set M with partial multiplication has left inverses with respect to right identities if there is an x making $xa = b$ whenever b is a right identity for M and ab is defined.

In the following, the equality $E = U \times A$ is deliberate.

Lemma 3.13. *Let (U, D_U, m_U) and (A, D_A, m_A) be sets with partial multiplications and with mutual actions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ defined on $H \subseteq A \times U$. Assume (P1)(a-c) and put the partial multiplication (2) on $E = U \times A$. Then the following hold.*

- (xi) *If and (P7)(a,e,g) hold and (u, α) is a right identity for $U \times A$, then u is a right identity for U and α is a right identity for A .*
- (xii) *If (P7)(a,e) hold then (u, α) is a right identity for $U \times A$ whenever u is a right identity for U and α is a right identity for A .*
- (xiii) *If A and U have right identities and (P7)(a,e,g) and (P5)(a) all hold, then (2) gives $U \times A$ right identities.*
- (xiv) *If A and U have left inverses with respect to right identities and (P2)(a,c), (P7)(a,c,e,g) and (P5)(b) hold, then (2) gives $U \times A$ left inverses with respect to right identities.*
- (xv) *If A and U are monoids, if $H = A \times U$ and if all of (P2)(a-d), (P6) and (P7)(a,d,e,f) all hold, then (2) makes $U \times A$ a monoid. Further, $j(u) = 1_A$ and $i(\alpha) = 1_U$ make valid embedding functions.*
- (xvi) *If A and U are groups, if $H = A \times U$ and if all of (P2)(a-d), (P6) and (P7)(a-h) hold, then (2) makes $U \times A$ a group.*

Proof. For (xi), we have $(v, \beta)(u, \alpha) = (v, \beta)$ for all (v, β) where $(v, \beta)(u, \alpha)$ is defined. This says $(v(\beta \cdot u), \beta^u \alpha) = (v, \beta)$ or $v(\beta \cdot u) = v$ and $\beta^u \alpha = \beta$. If $w(\beta \cdot u)$ is defined, then so is $(w, \beta)(u, \alpha)$ which must equal (w, β) and $w(\beta \cdot u) = w$. Thus $\beta \cdot u$ is a right identity for U and from (P7)(g) we have that u is also a right identity for U .

Now suppose that $\gamma\alpha$ is defined. By (P7)(e), $\gamma \cdot u$ is a right identity for U and the definition of right identity for U says that there is a $w \in U$ with $w(\gamma \cdot u)$ defined (and

thus equal to w). By (P7)(a), $\gamma^u = \gamma$ so $(w, \gamma)(u, \alpha) = (w(\gamma \cdot u), \gamma^u \alpha) = (w, \gamma \alpha)$ is defined and equals (w, γ) . Thus α is a right identity for A .

For (xii), if u is a right identity for U and α is a right identity for A , then $\beta \cdot u$ is a right identity for U by (P7)(e) and $\beta^u = \beta$ by (P7)(a). Now for any (v, β) in $U \times A$ with $(v, \beta)(u, \alpha)$ defined, we have

$$(v, \beta)(u, \alpha) = (v(\beta \cdot u), \beta^u \alpha) = (v, \beta \alpha) = (v, \beta).$$

That there is such a (v, β) follows because there must be a β with $\beta \alpha$ defined, and there must be a v with $v(\beta \cdot u)$ defined.

In (xiii), we are given (v, β) and want (u, α) so that $(v, \beta)(u, \alpha) = (v, \beta)$. Thus we want $(v(\beta \cdot u), \beta^u \alpha) = (v, \beta)$. Since there are right identities in U , there is a value for $\beta \cdot u$ that is a right identity for U for which $v(\beta \cdot u)$ is defined (and thus equal to v). From (P5)(a), there is a u so that $\beta \cdot u$ has the right value, and from (P7)(g), we have that u is a right identity for U . Now (P7)(a) gives that $\beta^u = \beta$ and the existence of right identities in A gives a right identity α for A so that $\beta^u \alpha = \beta \alpha = \beta$. Now if $(w, \gamma)(u, \alpha)$ is defined, then we have $(w(\gamma \cdot u), \gamma^u \alpha) = (w, \gamma)$ since (P7)(e) gives that $\gamma \cdot u$ is a right identity for U and (P7)(a) gives that $\gamma^u = \gamma$ and we already know that α is a right identity for A .

In (xiv), we want a solution (w, γ) to $(w, \gamma)(v, \beta) = (u, \alpha)$ when (u, α) is a right identity for $U \times A$ and $(v, \beta)(u, \alpha) = (v(\beta \cdot u), \beta^u \alpha)$ is defined. Thus we want $(w(\gamma \cdot v), \gamma^v \beta) = (u, \alpha)$. From item (xi), we know that u is a right identity for U and α is a right identity for A . Thus $\beta^u = \beta$ by (P7)(a) and $\beta \alpha$ is defined. This gives a solution δ to $\delta \beta = \alpha$. There is a solution γ to $\gamma^v = \delta$ by (P5)(b). Thus we have $\gamma^v \beta = \alpha$.

We want a solution w to $w(\gamma \cdot v) = u$. We know that u is a right identity for U , and we need to know that $(\gamma \cdot v)u$ is defined. From $(v, \beta)(u, \alpha) = (v, \beta)$, we know that $v(\beta \cdot u) = v$. Thus

$$\gamma \cdot v = \gamma \cdot (v(\beta \cdot u)) = (\gamma \cdot v)((\gamma^v \beta) \cdot u) = (\gamma \cdot v)(\alpha \cdot u) = (\gamma \cdot v)u$$

where the second equality uses (P2)(a,c) and the last equality uses (P7)(c). Thus $(\gamma \cdot v)u$ is defined (and of course equal to $\gamma \cdot v$), and our hypotheses say that there is a solution w to $w(\gamma \cdot v) = u$.

In (xv), (P2) and (P6) give an associative, full multiplication. The assumed parts of (P7), item (xii) and the unstated variation of (xii) for left identities give a full identity. Since the multiplication is full, we get a global identity. The checks that i and j are embedding functions is trivial.

In (xvi), we get (P5)(a,b) from the fact that we are dealing with groups and the rest of the hypotheses say that $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ are actions. The rest follows from (xv), (xiv), and the variant of (xiv) with left and right reversed. $\square$

3.11. Monoids and groups . Recall that Lemma 3.10 assembles a long list of hypotheses to create embeddings of A and U into the product created by (2). Global identities tend to make the task much easier. If A has a global identity 1, if $U \times \{1\} \subseteq E$, and if P7(d,f) hold, then mapping $u \mapsto (u, 1)$ is a monomorphism and a symmetric statement holds for an embedding of A . Under the hypotheses of Lemma 3.13(xv) with 1 denoting the global identities of both U and A , we have $(u, 1)(1, \alpha) = (u, \alpha)$ and $(1, \alpha)(u, 1) = (\alpha \cdot u, \alpha^u)$. We can identify U and A with $U \times \{1\}$ and $\{1\} \times A$, respectively, and we see that $u\alpha$ naturally represents the product in $U \times A$ and that the functions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ tell how to

evaluate αu by “reversing” the product to something of the form $u'\alpha'$ with $u' \in U$ and $\alpha' \in A$.

One typical application of the Zappa-Szép product will be to combine a monoid and a group under the hypotheses of Lemma 3.13(xv). If U is a monoid and A is a group, then the previous paragraph applies and we can regard U and A as substructures of the product. If Lemma 3.13(xv) applies, then there is a global identity on $U \times A$. If we have $\alpha \in A$ and $u \in U$, then we get $\alpha^u \in A$ which is then invertible. A formula for the inverse is obtained by looking at $(\alpha^{-1}\alpha)^u = (\alpha^{-1})^{(\alpha \cdot u)}\alpha^u$. However, this product must be 1 since $(\alpha^{-1}\alpha)^u = 1^u = 1$ by Corollary 3.3.1. Thus we have

$$(4) \quad (\alpha^u)^{-1} = (\alpha^{-1})^{(\alpha \cdot u)}.$$

3.12. Least common left multiples. We continue our list of properties on the product with a study of least common left multiples. This is the most complicated.

Lemma 3.14. *Let (U, D_U, m_U) and (A, D_A, m_A) be sets with partial multiplications and with mutual actions $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ and $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ defined on $H \subseteq A \times U$. Assume (P1)(a-c) and put the partial multiplication (2) on $E = U \times A$. Assume further the hypotheses of Lemma 3.13(xv). Then the following holds.*

(xvii) *If U is a cancellative monoid with least common left multiples, if A is a group, and if (P8) holds, then the multiplication on $U \times A$ has least common left multiples. Further, the least common left multiple $(r, \alpha)(u, \theta) = (s, \beta)(v, \phi)$ of (u, θ) and (v, ϕ) in $U \times A$ can be constructed so that $r(\alpha \cdot u) = s(\beta \cdot v)$ is the least common left multiple of $(\alpha \cdot u)$ and $(\beta \cdot v)$ in U . Lastly, if $U \times A$ is cancellative (e.g., (P4)(a) holds), then any least common left multiple $(r, \alpha)(u, \theta) = (s, \beta)(v, \phi)$ of (u, θ) and (v, ϕ) in $U \times A$ has the property that $r(\alpha \cdot u) = s(\beta \cdot v)$ is the least common left multiple of $(\alpha \cdot u)$ and $(\beta \cdot v)$ in U .*

We need an intermediate lemma.

Lemma 3.15. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.14, let u and v be in U with a least common left multiple $l = wu = zv$, let γ be in A and let $\alpha = \gamma^w$ and $\beta = \gamma^z$. Then*

$$q = \gamma \cdot l = (\gamma \cdot q)(\alpha \cdot u) = (\gamma \cdot z)(\beta \cdot v)$$

is the least common left multiple of the pair $(\alpha \cdot u, \beta \cdot v)$.

Proof. Since $q = \gamma \cdot l = \gamma \cdot (wu) = \gamma \cdot (zv)$, we have

$$q = (\gamma \cdot w)((\gamma)^w \cdot u) = (\gamma \cdot w)(\alpha \cdot u), \quad \text{and}$$

$$q = (\gamma \cdot z)((\gamma)^z \cdot v) = (\gamma \cdot z)(\beta \cdot v).$$

Thus q is a common left multiple of $(\alpha \cdot u, \beta \cdot v)$ and this pair has a least common left multiple by hypothesis. We will use Lemma 2.4(c) to argue that q is a least common left multiple by showing that any common left factor of $(\alpha \cdot u, \beta \cdot v)$ is a unit.

Suppose $(\gamma \cdot w) = fh$ and $(\gamma \cdot z) = fj$. Now $w = (\gamma^{-1} \cdot f)((\gamma^{-1})^f \cdot h)$ and $z = (\gamma^{-1} \cdot f)((\gamma^{-1})^f \cdot j)$. This makes $(\gamma^{-1} \cdot f)$ a common left factor of (w, z) and a unit by Lemma 2.4(c). Thus $(\gamma^{-1} \cdot f)k = 1$ for some k and

$$1 = \gamma \cdot 1 = \gamma \cdot ((\gamma^{-1} \cdot f)k) = f(\gamma^{(\gamma^{-1} \cdot f)} \cdot k)$$

by Corollary 3.3.1 and f is a unit. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 3.14. We will use the remarks in Paragraph 3.11 and write $u\alpha$ instead of the pair (u, α) in $U \times A$.

For u and v in U and θ and ϕ in A , we are to find a least common left multiple of $u\theta$ and $v\phi$ assuming that they have a common left multiple. It is trivial that this pair has a common left multiple if and only if u and $v\phi\theta^{-1}$ have a common left multiple. Further, $p(u\theta) = q(v\phi)$ will be the least common left multiple of $u\theta$ and $v\phi$ if and only if $pu = q(v\phi\theta^{-1})$ is the least common left multiple of u and $v\phi\theta^{-1}$. Thus we shall assume u and v in U with ϕ in A and we will look for a least common left multiple of u and $v\phi$ assuming that they have a common left multiple.

We start with $(x\alpha)(u) = (y\beta)(v\phi)$ or $x(\alpha \cdot u)(\alpha^u) = y(\beta \cdot v)(\beta^v\phi)$. This means that two equations hold: $x(\alpha \cdot u) = y(\beta \cdot v)$, and $\alpha^u = \beta^v\phi$.

By assumption there are r and s so that

$$(5) \quad r(\alpha \cdot u) = s(\beta \cdot v)$$

is the least common left multiple of the pair $(\alpha \cdot u, \beta \cdot v)$.

From $r(\alpha \cdot u) = s(\beta \cdot v)$ $\alpha^u = \beta^v\phi$ we know $r(\alpha \cdot u)\alpha^u = s(\beta \cdot v)\beta^v\phi$ or

$$(6) \quad (r\alpha)u = (s\beta)(v\phi).$$

This is our candidate least common left multiple for the pair $(u, v\phi)$. If we show that it is a least common left multiple, then it satisfies the last sentence of the statement of Lemma 3.14.

Now assume that $(z\gamma)(u) = (w\delta)(v\phi)$ or $z(\gamma \cdot u)(\gamma^u) = w(\delta \cdot v)(\delta^v\phi)$. This means that two equations hold: $z(\gamma \cdot u) = w(\delta \cdot v)$, and $\gamma^u = \delta^v\phi$. From the two equalities, $\alpha^u = \beta^v\phi$ and $\gamma^u = \delta^v\phi$ we get two expressions for ϕ which must be equal. Thus we have $(\beta^v)^{-1}(\alpha^u) = \phi = (\delta^v)^{-1}(\gamma^u)$ or $(\delta^v)(\beta^v)^{-1} = (\gamma^u)(\alpha^u)^{-1}$.

Using (4), we can work on each side. The left side becomes

$$(\delta^v)(\beta^v)^{-1} = (\delta^v)(\beta^{-1})^{(\beta \cdot v)} = (\delta)^{(\beta^{-1} \cdot \beta \cdot v)}(\beta^{-1})^{(\beta \cdot v)} = (\delta\beta^{-1})^{(\beta \cdot v)}.$$

Similarly, the right side becomes $(\gamma^u)(\alpha^u)^{-1} = (\gamma\alpha^{-1})^{(\alpha \cdot u)}$.

We thus have the equation

$$(\gamma\alpha^{-1})^{(\alpha \cdot u)} = (\delta\beta^{-1})^{(\beta \cdot v)}$$

and we have the least common left multiple (5) of the pair $(\alpha \cdot u, \beta \cdot v)$.

The assumption (P8) and Lemma 3.6 says there is an η so that $\gamma\alpha^{-1} = (\eta)^r$ and $\delta\beta^{-1} = (\eta)^s$. Lemma 3.15 says that

$$q = (\eta \cdot r)((\gamma\alpha^{-1}) \cdot (\alpha \cdot u)) = (\eta \cdot s)((\delta\beta^{-1}) \cdot (\beta \cdot v))$$

is the least common left multiple of the pair $((\gamma\alpha^{-1}) \cdot (\alpha \cdot u), (\delta\beta^{-1}) \cdot (\beta \cdot v))$. Equivalently,

$$q = (\eta \cdot r)(\gamma \cdot u) = (\eta \cdot s)(\delta \cdot v)$$

is the least common left multiple of the pair $(\gamma \cdot u, \delta \cdot v)$.

From the equality $z(\gamma \cdot u) = w(\delta \cdot v)$ we know that there is a k so that the common left multiple $z(\gamma \cdot u) = w(\delta \cdot v)$ of the pair $(\gamma \cdot u, \delta \cdot v)$ satisfies

$$z(\gamma \cdot u) = w(\delta \cdot v) = k(\eta \cdot r)(\gamma \cdot u) = k(\eta \cdot s)(\delta \cdot v).$$

Thus $z = k(\eta \cdot r)$ and $w = k(\eta \cdot s)$.

We have the candidate least common left multiple (6) for the pair $(u, v\phi)$. We consider

$$(k\eta)(r\alpha)u = (k\eta)(s\beta)(v\phi).$$

The left side becomes

$$(k\eta)(r\alpha)u = k(\eta \cdot r)(\eta)^r \alpha u = z(\gamma\alpha^{-1})\alpha u = (z\gamma)u$$

and the right side becomes

$$(k\eta)(s\beta)(v\phi) = k(\eta \cdot s)(\eta)^s \beta(v\phi) = w(\delta\beta^{-1})\beta(v\phi) = (w\delta)(v\phi)$$

which is what we wanted.

We have found one least common left multiple $(r, \alpha)(u, \theta) = (s, \beta)(v, \phi)$ of (u, θ) and (v, ϕ) in $U \times A$ so that $r(\alpha \cdot u) = s(\beta \cdot v)$ is the least common left multiple of $(\alpha \cdot u)$ and $(\beta \cdot v)$ in U . If (P4)(a) holds, then $U \times A$ is cancellative by Lemma 3.12(viii) and the corresponding conclusion for left cancellative since we know that the fact that A is a group implies that (P4)(b) also holds. Let $(r', \alpha')(u, \theta) = (s', \beta')(v, \phi)$ be another least common left multiple of (u, θ) and (v, ϕ) . From Lemma 2.4(a), we know that there is an invertible element (t, γ) so that

$$(7) \quad (r', \alpha')(u, \theta) = (s', \beta')(v, \phi) = (t, \gamma)(r, \alpha)(u, \theta) = (t, \gamma)(s, \beta)(v, \phi).$$

Expanding and setting the first coordinates equal in the third and fourth expressions gives

$$(8) \quad t(\gamma \cdot r)((\gamma^r \alpha) \cdot u) = t(\gamma \cdot s)((\gamma^s \beta) \cdot v).$$

From Lemma 3.15, we know that

$$(\gamma \cdot r)((\gamma^r \alpha) \cdot u) = (\gamma \cdot s)((\gamma^s \beta) \cdot v)$$

is a least common left multiple of $((\gamma^r \alpha) \cdot u)$ and $((\gamma^s \beta) \cdot v)$ in U . An easy calculation based on the fact that (t, γ) is invertible shows that t is invertible in U , so Lemma 2.4(a) shows that (8) is also a least common left multiple of $((\gamma^r \alpha) \cdot u)$ and $((\gamma^s \beta) \cdot v)$ in U . From (7) and cancellativity, we have $(r', \alpha') = (t, \gamma)(r, \alpha)$ which implies that $r' = t(\gamma \cdot r)$ and $\alpha' = \gamma^r \alpha$. Similarly, $s' = t(\gamma \cdot s)$ and $\beta' = \gamma^s \beta$. Combining this with (8) gives $r'(\alpha' \cdot u) = s'(\beta' \cdot v)$ is a least common left multiple in U of $(\alpha' \cdot u)$ and $(\beta' \cdot v)$ which is what we wanted. $\square$

3.13. Presentations. Because of the difficulties of embedding the factors in the Zappa-Szép product unless there are identities, we will not attempt to describe presentations of Zappa-Szép products of semigroups. In all probability, the Zappa-Szép product of two semigroups presented as $\langle X_i \mid R_i \rangle$, $i = 1, 2$, would need a generating set based on $X_1 \times X_2$. In the monoid case, we can get by with $X_1 \cup X_2$.

Lemma 3.16. *Under the hypotheses of Lemma 3.13(xv), if the monoids U and A have a presentations $\langle X \mid R \rangle$ and $\langle Y \mid T \rangle$, respectively, with $X \cap Y = \emptyset$, then a presentation for the structure defined by (2) on $U \times A$ is*

$$(9) \quad \langle X \cup Y \mid R \cup T \cup W \rangle$$

in which W consists of all pairs $(\alpha u, (\alpha \cdot u)(\alpha^u))$ for $(\alpha, u) \in A \times U$.

Proof. We send $x \in X$ to $(x, 1)$ and $y \in Y$ to $(1, y)$. The comments in Paragraph 3.11 show that this extends to a homomorphism from the presentation to the Zappa-Szép product which takes any word in X representing some $u \in U$ to $(u, 1)$ and any word in Y representing some $\alpha \in A$ to $(1, \alpha)$. The relations allow us to reduce any word in the generators to a word of the form $u\alpha$ where u is a word in the alphabet X and α is a word in the alphabet A . This word is sent to (u, α) . If such a word $u\alpha$ is sent to $(1, 1)$, then u is the identity for U and must reduce to the empty word

using R and α is the identity in A which must reduce to the empty word using T . $\square$

Even if the presentations $\langle X \mid R \rangle$ and $\langle Y \mid T \rangle$ of the previous lemma are small, the presentation (9) is large since W has an entry for every pair in $A \times U$. Under some rather special hypotheses, we get a smaller presentation that is sometimes complete.

Lemma 3.17. *Under the hypotheses of Lemma 3.13(xv), if the monoids U and A have presentations $\langle X \mid R \rangle$ and $\langle Y \mid T \rangle$, respectively, with $X \cap Y = \emptyset$, if the function $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ takes $Y \times X$ into X , and if the function $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ takes $Y \times X$ into Y , then a presentation for the structure defined by (2) on $U \times A$ is*

$$(10) \quad \langle X \cup Y \mid R \cup T \cup W \rangle$$

in which W consists of all pairs $(\alpha u, (\alpha \cdot u)(\alpha^u))$ for $(\alpha, u) \in Y \times X$.

Proof. The proof is word for word identical to the proof of Lemma 3.16. The justifications for the words are slightly different. $\square$

Question: if the presentations $\langle X \mid R \rangle$ and $\langle Y \mid T \rangle$ in Lemma 3.17 are complete, then must the presentation (10) be complete?

The hypotheses of Lemma 3.17 might be hard to attain. We discuss some weaker hypotheses. Assume that presentations $\langle X \mid R \rangle$ and $\langle Y \mid T \rangle$ of the monoids U and A , respectively, are given with $X \cap Y = \emptyset$, and that functions $Y \times X \rightarrow Y^*$ written $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ and $Y \times X \rightarrow X$ written $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ are given. The unequal treatment of the codomains (X in one case and Y^* in the other) is deliberate.

We extend these to functions $Y^* \times X^* \rightarrow Y^*$ and $Y^* \times X^* \rightarrow X^*$ as follows. Form the monoid presentation

$$(11) \quad \langle X \cup Y \mid W \rangle$$

in which W is regarded as a set of rewriting rules and consists of all pairs $(\alpha u \rightarrow (\alpha \cdot u)(\alpha^u))$ for $(\alpha, u) \in Y \times X$.

Lemma 3.18. *The presentation (11) is complete.*

Proof. Let w be a word in the alphabet $X \cup Y$ and assume that there are n appearances of elements of X in w and that they are numbered from left to right in w . Let $C_w = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)$ where c_i is the number of elements of Y in w that are to the left of the i -th element of X in w . An application of $\rightarrow$ involves a particular consecutive pair αu in w with $\alpha \in Y$ and $u \in X$. If the pair involves the i -th element of X in w , then applying $\rightarrow$ keeps all c_j with $j < i$ the same, lowers c_i by one, and is unpredictable on the c_j for $j > i$. It is standard that no infinite sequence of such changes can be applied to an n -tuple of elements of $\mathbf{N}$, so $\rightarrow$ is terminating. It is easy to check that $\rightarrow$ is strongly coherent since two applications of $\rightarrow$ to the same word are either the same or involve disjoint pairs in w . $\square$

The irreducibles are of the form $u\alpha$ with u a word in the alphabet X and α a word in the alphabet Y . This expresses the monoid presented by (11) as a Zappa-Szép product of the free monoids X^* and Y^* . From Lemma 3.2 we get our desired extensions and in addition get the fact that they satisfy the four identities (P2)(a–d).

The extensions to the functions clearly satisfy (P6) and since all structures under discussion are monoids, Corollary 3.3.1 implies that they also satisfy (P7)(a–f). We

are now in a position to state the following lemma. Its importance is that the hypotheses are stated entirely in terms of X , Y , R and T without reference to X^* , Y^* , R' or T' . In another paper, the author uses this lemma to prove that a certain Zappa-Szép product used in combining the Thompson groups with the braid groups has a given presentation.

Lemma 3.19. *Assume that presentations $\langle X \mid R \rangle$ and $\langle Y \mid T \rangle$ of the monoids U and A , respectively, are given with $X \cap Y = \emptyset$, and that functions $Y \times X \rightarrow Y^*$ written $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha^u$ and $Y \times X \rightarrow X$ written $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ are given. Let $\sim_R$ and $\sim_T$ denote the equivalence relations on X^* and Y^* , respectively, imposed by the relation sets R and T , respectively.*

Let the functions be extended to $Y^* \times X^*$ as above and assume that they satisfy the following. If (u, v) is in R , then for all $\alpha \in Y$ we have $(\alpha \cdot u, \alpha \cdot v)$ or $(\alpha \cdot v, \alpha \cdot u)$ is in R and $\alpha^u \sim_T \alpha^v$. If (α, β) is in T , then for all $u \in X$ we have $\alpha \cdot u = \beta \cdot u$ and $\alpha^u \sim_T \beta^u$. Then the extensions induce well defined functions $A \times U \rightarrow A$ and $A \times U \rightarrow U$ that satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 3.17 and thus the conclusions of that lemma hold. Further, the restriction of the function $A \times U \rightarrow U$ to $A \times X$ has its image in X .

The assymetry in the hypotheses is deliberate. Note that the last sentence implies that the equality $\alpha \cdot u = \beta \cdot u$ demanded when (α, β) is in T and u is in X is an equality of elements of X .

Proof. If u is in X and α is in Y^* , then the identity $(\alpha\beta) \cdot u = \alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot u)$ and our assumption that $(\alpha, u) \mapsto \alpha \cdot u$ has image in X (as opposed to X^*) implies that $\alpha \cdot u$ is in X . When it is shown that the hypothesized functions induce well defined functions on $A \times U$, we will automatically have the last sentence of the statement.

It suffices to prove that $\alpha \sim_T \alpha'$ implies both $(\alpha \cdot u) \sim_R (\alpha' \cdot u)$ and $\alpha^u \sim_T (\alpha')^u$, and also that $u \sim_R u'$ implies both $(\alpha \cdot u) \sim_R (\alpha \cdot u')$ and $\alpha^u \sim_T \alpha^{u'}$. Note that we have restricted versions of these conclusions as hypotheses of the lemma. Our task to extend what is known.

Step 1. Given (u, u') in R and $\alpha \in Y^*$, we will show that $(\alpha \cdot u, \alpha \cdot u')$ or $(\alpha \cdot u', \alpha \cdot u)$ is in R . This follows immediately from $(\alpha\beta) \cdot u = \alpha \cdot (\beta \cdot u)$ and the assumption that what we want is true when α is in Y .

Step 2. Given α and α' in Y^* with $\alpha \sim_T \alpha'$ and $u \in X$, we will show that $\alpha \cdot u = \alpha' \cdot u$. It suffices to assume that $\alpha \rightarrow_T \alpha'$. We have $\alpha = \theta\beta\rho$ and $\alpha' = \theta\beta'\rho$ with (β, β') in T . Now $(\theta\beta\rho) \cdot u = \theta \cdot (\beta \cdot (\rho \cdot u))$ and $(\theta\beta'\rho) \cdot u = \theta \cdot (\beta' \cdot (\rho \cdot u))$. Our assumptions are that $\rho \cdot u$ is some $v \in X$, and that $\beta \cdot v = \beta' \cdot v$. This completes the step.

Step 3. Given α and α' in Y^* with $\alpha \sim_T \alpha'$ and $u \in X$, we will show that $\alpha^u \sim_T (\alpha')^u$. It suffices to assume that $\alpha \rightarrow_T \alpha'$. We have $\alpha = \theta\beta\rho$ and $\alpha' = \theta\beta'\rho$ with (β, β') in T . Now

$$(\theta\beta\rho)^u = (\theta^{(\beta\rho \cdot u)})(\beta^{\rho \cdot u})(\rho^u)$$

and

$$(\theta\beta'\rho)^u = (\theta^{(\beta'\rho \cdot u)})(\beta'^{\rho \cdot u})(\rho^u).$$

The third factors are identical. The common exponent $\rho \cdot u$ in the second factors is an element of X by hypothesis and so the second factors are related by $\sim_T$ by hypothesis. The exponents in the first factors are $(\beta\rho) \cdot u = \beta \cdot (\rho \cdot u)$ and $(\beta'\rho) \cdot u = \beta' \cdot (\rho \cdot u)$. With $\rho \cdot u$ in X , our hypotheses say that these exponents are

equal and so the first factors are equal. The fact that $\sim_T$ is a congruence relation completes the step.

Step 4. Given α and α' in Y^* with $\alpha \sim_T \alpha'$ and $u \in X^*$, we will show that $\alpha^u \sim_T (\alpha')^u$. This follows from Step 3 and the fact that $\alpha^{(uv)} = (\alpha^u)^v$.

Step 5. Given α and α' in Y^* with $\alpha \sim_T \alpha'$ and $u \in X^*$, we will show that $\alpha \cdot u = \alpha' \cdot u$. If u is in X , we are done by Step 2. If $u = vw$ with $v \in X$ and $w \in X^*$, then

$$\alpha \cdot u = \alpha \cdot (vw) = (\alpha \cdot v)(\alpha^v \cdot w),$$

and

$$\alpha' \cdot u = \alpha' \cdot (vw) = (\alpha' \cdot v)((\alpha')^v \cdot w).$$

By Step 2, the first factors are equal. By Step 3, $\alpha^v \sim_T (\alpha')^v$ and we are done by induction on the length of u .

Step 6. Given (u, u') in R and $\alpha \in Y^*$, we will show that $\alpha^u \sim_T \alpha^{u'}$. We are done by hypothesis if α is in Y . If $\alpha = \beta\gamma$ with $\beta \in Y^*$ and $\gamma \in Y$, then

$$\alpha^u = (\beta\gamma)^u = (\beta^{\gamma \cdot u})(\gamma^u),$$

and

$$\alpha^{u'} = (\beta\gamma)^{u'} = (\beta^{\gamma \cdot u'})(\gamma^{u'}).$$

We have $\gamma^u \sim_T \gamma^{u'}$ by hypothesis. We also have $(\gamma \cdot u, \gamma \cdot u')$ or $(\gamma \cdot u', \gamma \cdot u)$ in R by hypothesis and we are done by induction on the length of α .

Step 7. Given u and u' in X^* with $u \sim_R u'$ and $\alpha \in Y^*$, we will show that $\alpha^u \sim_T \alpha^{u'}$. It suffices to assume $u \rightarrow_T u'$. We have $u = xyz$ and $u' = xy'z$ with (y, y') in R . Now $\alpha^u = ((\alpha^x)^y)^z$ and $\alpha^{u'} = ((\alpha^x)^{y'})^z$. Letting $\beta = \alpha^x$ in Y^* , we have $\gamma = \beta^y$ and $\gamma' = \beta^{y'}$ related by $\sim_T$ by Step 6. Now $\gamma^z \sim_T (\gamma')^z$ by Step 4.

Step 8. Given u and u' in X^* with $u \sim_R u'$ and $\alpha \in Y^*$, we will show that $\alpha \cdot u \sim_R \alpha \cdot u'$. It suffices to assume $u \rightarrow_R u'$. We have $u = xyz$ and $u' = xy'z$ with (y, y') in R . Now

$$\alpha \cdot u = \alpha \cdot (xyz) = (\alpha \cdot x)(\alpha^x \cdot y)(\alpha^{(xy)} \cdot z),$$

and

$$\alpha \cdot u' = \alpha \cdot (xy'z) = (\alpha \cdot x)(\alpha^x \cdot y')(\alpha^{(xy')} \cdot z).$$

The first factors are identical. One of the pairs $(\alpha^x \cdot y, \alpha^x \cdot y')$ or $(\alpha^x \cdot y', \alpha^x \cdot y)$ is in R by Step 1. We have $\alpha^{(xy)} \sim_T \alpha^{(xy')}$ by Step 7 and we have that the third factors are equal by Step 5.

Steps 4, 5, 7 and 8 finish showing that the extensions to $Y^* \times X^*$ induce well defined functions on $A \times U$.

Multiplication on A and U and the induced functions on $A \times U$ are defined by use of representatives. Since the multiplications and functions are full, it does not matter which representatives are chosen. Thus equations in the monoid are preserved and (P2)(a–d) must hold for the induced functions as do (P7)(a–d). Similarly (P7)(e,f) hold since the form that they take in monoids is that the identities are preserved. Lastly, we get (P6) from the fact that the extensions are defined on all of $Y^* \times X^*$. $\square$

3.14. Associativity of the Zappa-Szép product. We would like to show that the Zappa-Szép product is associative in that the map $(u, (v, a)) \mapsto ((u, v), a)$ gives an isomorphism from $U \bowtie (V \bowtie A)$ to $(U \bowtie V) \bowtie A$. It turns out that it is often easy to establish the isomorphism once it is known that the two expressions $U \bowtie (V \bowtie A)$ and $(U \bowtie V) \bowtie A$ make sense. What is complicated is making sense out of the two expressions. In Zappa-Szép products of more than three factors, there are more expressions to interpret.

Our first step is to assume that we are working with the internal Zappa-Szép product. This allows us to get isomorphisms from the fact that two or more expressions accurately represent one fixed multiplicative structure.

There are still problems with the internal Zappa-Szép product. In the internal product, the expression $U \bowtie V$ implies that U and V are substructures of $U \bowtie V$. However, the expression $(U \bowtie V) \bowtie A$ invites the possibility that the substructure $(U \bowtie V)$ of $(U \bowtie V) \bowtie A$ contains neither U nor V . If one insists that these containments hold, then some properties must be assumed to make them so. We have been unable to find better hypotheses than the direct assumption that these containments hold.

Note that there does not seem to be a problem if the expressions $U \bowtie (V \bowtie A)$ and $(U \bowtie V) \bowtie A$ are both assumed valid. After all, if all products are internal, then U and V are in $U \bowtie V$ and V and A are in $V \bowtie A$ by definitions. However, if only one expression, say $U \bowtie (V \bowtie A)$, is assumed to be valid, then we have no reason to assume that U and V are contained in UV nor can we assume that UV is even closed under the product structure. This gets worse in longer expressions such as $U \bowtie (V \bowtie (A \bowtie B))$.

One way out of this is to assume that the containing structure is a monoid. Another method, given below, is to make a large number of containment assumptions.

We start with one approach to the situation involving three factors. We will modify our approach somewhat when more factors are involved.

We assume the following. There is a set with partial multiplication (M, D, m) and three subsets U , V and A of M that satisfy the six statements below.

- (1) All of U , V and A are closed under m in that if $x Dy$ and x and y are in U (for example), then $xy \in U$.
- (2) The two products UV and VA are “unique factorization products” in that if $y \in UV$ (for example), then y is uniquely expressible as $y = uv$ with $u \in U$ and $v \in V$.
- (3) The two subsets UV and VA are “semi-permutable” in that $VU \subseteq UV$ and $AV \subseteq VA$.
- (4) The containments $U \subseteq UV$, $V \subseteq UV \cap VA$ and $A \subseteq VA$ all hold.
- (5) The set with multiplication (M, D, m) is categorical.
- (6) Every element of M is uniquely expressible as uw with $u \in U$ and $w \in VA$.

The last assumption is the only one that does not treat U and A symmetrically.

The assumptions (1) and (3) and the associativity implicit in (5) easily give that UV and VA are closed under the multiplication. The categorical property is inherited by both UV and VA . From (1), (2), (4), (5) and (6) we can write $M \simeq U \bowtie (V \bowtie A)$ in which the isomorphism takes uva to $(u, (v, a))$, and we know that every $x \in M$ is uniquely expressible as $x = u(va)$ with $u \in U$, $v \in V$ and $a \in A$. Now every $x \in M$ is expressible as ya with $y \in UV$ and $a \in A$, and

$uva \mapsto ((u, v), a)$ is an isomorphism from M to $(U \bowtie V) \bowtie A$. Thus we have proven the following.

Lemma 3.20. *Given a set with partial multiplication (M, D, m) and subsets U, V and A of M satisfying (1–6) above, the multiplication gives mutual actions for all of the pairs (U, V) , (V, A) , (UV, A) and (U, VA) and the maps $(u, (v, a)) \mapsto uva \mapsto ((u, v), a)$ give isomorphisms $U \bowtie (V \bowtie A) \rightarrow M \rightarrow (U \bowtie V) \bowtie A$.*

As remarked above, Lemma 3.20 holds if M is a monoid.

Abused notation can mislead. Given $a \in A$ and $u \in U$, we have $au = u'v'a'$ with $u' \in U$, $v' \in V$ and $a' \in A$. It is tempting to write $au = (a \cdot u)(a^u)$ and make conclusions. In fact from the structure of M as $(U \bowtie V) \bowtie A$, we get $au = (a \cdot u)_1(a^u)_1$ with $(a \cdot u)_1 \in UV$ and $(a^u)_1 \in A$ so that $(a \cdot u)_1 = u'v'$ and $(a^u)_1 = a'$. From the structure of M as $U \bowtie (V \bowtie A)$, we get $au = (a \cdot u)_2(a^u)_2$ with $(a \cdot u)_2 \in U$ and $(a^u)_2 \in VA$ so that $(a \cdot u)_2 = u'$ and $(a^u)_2 = v'a'$.

To discuss higher iterations of the Zappa-Szép product, we need some notation.

If $\odot$ is a binary operation we let

$$(12) \quad E(X_1 \odot X_2 \odot X_3 \odot \cdots \odot X_{n-1} \odot X_n)$$

denote a parenthesization so that the order of operations is well defined. If the X_i are replaced by Y_i and $\odot$ is replaced by another binary operation $\square$, then

$$(13) \quad E(Y_1 \square Y_2 \square Y_3 \square \cdots \square Y_{n-1} \square Y_n)$$

using the same symbol E will represent the “same” parenthesization of the expression as in (12). That is, if the parenthesization scheme imposed by E is represented by a binary tree, then the same binary tree is used to control the parenthesization in both (12) and (13). We will also use the lowly comma “,” as a binary operation that creates ordered pairs. With E the same symbol as in (12) and (13), we get

$$E(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n)$$

as a well defined parenthesization that reduces the ordered n -tuple $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ to an heirarchy of ordered pairs based on the same binary tree used in (12) and (13).

We now consider a set with partial multiplication (M, D, m) and a finite number of subsets $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n$ of M . For $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ we let $W_i^j = U_i U_{i+1} \cdots U_j$. Note that $W_i^i = U_i$. We make the following assumptions.

- (a) The set with partial multiplication (M, D, m) is categorical.
- (b) Each $x \in M$ is uniquely expressible as $x = u_1 u_2 \cdots u_n$ with each $u_i \in U_i$.
- (c) For $i < n$ and $u_i \in U_i$ there is a $u_{i+1} \in U_{i+1}$ so that $u_i u_{i+1}$ is defined and equal to u_i , and for $1 < j$ and $u_j \in U_j$ there is a $u_{j-1} \in U_{j-1}$ so that $u_{j-1} u_j$ is defined and equal to u_j .
- (d) For $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, the set W_i^j is closed under the multiplication.

It follows from (a) that all the W_i^j are categorical. For $i \leq k \leq l \leq j$, it follows from (a) and (c) that $W_k^l \subseteq W_i^j$. Thus for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, we have $W_i^j \subseteq M$ and we get from (b) that every $w \in W_i^j$ is uniquely expressible as $w = u_i u_{i+1} \cdots u_j$ with each $u_k \in U_k$. For $1 \leq i \leq j < k \leq n$, Lemma 3.9 says that sending $(u_i u_{i+1} \cdots u_j, u_{j+1} \cdots u_k)$ to $u_i u_{i+1} \cdots u_k$ gives an isomorphism from $W_i^j \bowtie W_{j+1}^k$ to W_i^k . We now inductively have the following.

Lemma 3.21. *Let (M, D, m) be a set with partial multiplication, let $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n$ be a finite number of subsets of M , and assume that (a–d) above hold. Then for*

each parenthesization $E(U_1 \bowtie U_2 \bowtie \cdots \bowtie U_n)$, sending $E(u_1, u_2, u_3, \dots, u_{n-1}, u_n)$ to $u_1 u_2 \cdots u_n$ is an isomorphism from $E(U_1 \bowtie U_2 \bowtie \cdots \bowtie U_n)$ to M .

REFERENCES

1. B. Benninghofen, S. Kemmerich, and M. M. Richter, *Systems of reductions*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987, With a chapter by Friedrich Otto.
2. J. W. Cannon, W. J. Floyd, and W. R. Parry, *Introductory notes on Richard Thompson's groups*, Enseign. Math. (2) **42** (1996), no. 3-4, 215–256.
3. Giuseppina Casadio, *Costruzione di gruppi come prodotto di sottogruppi permutabili*, Univ. Roma e Ist. Naz. Alta Mat. Rend. Mat. e Appl. (5) **2** (1941), 348–360.
4. Daniel E. Cohen, *Combinatorial group theory: a topological approach*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.
5. ———, *String rewriting—a survey for group theorists*, Geometric group theory, Vol. 1 (Sussex, 1991), Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1993, pp. 37–47.
6. P. M. Cohn, *Universal algebra*, second ed., D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht, 1981.
7. Nachum Dershowitz and Jean-Pierre Jouannaud, *Rewrite systems*, Handbook of theoretical computer science, Vol. B, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1990, pp. 243–320.
8. B. Huppert, *Endliche Gruppen. I*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1967.
9. Saunders MacLane, *Categories for the working mathematician*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 5.
10. M. H. A. Newman, *On theories with a combinatorial definition of “equivalence.”*, Ann. of Math. (2) **43** (1942), 223–243.
11. L. Rédei, *Die Anwendung des schiefen Produktes in der Gruppentheorie*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **188** (1950), 201–227.
12. Craig C. Squier, *Word problems and a homological finiteness condition for monoids*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **49** (1987), no. 1-2, 201–217.
13. J. Szép, *On factorisable, not simple groups*, Acta Univ. Szeged. Sect. Sci. Math. **13** (1950), 239–241.
14. ———, *Über eine neue Erweiterung von Ringen. I*, Acta Sci. Math. Szeged **19** (1958), 51–62.
15. Jenő Szép, *Sulle strutture fattorizzabili*, Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat. (8) **32** (1962), 649–652.
16. Guido Zappa, *Sulla costruzione dei gruppi prodotto di due dati sottogruppi permutabili tra loro*, Atti Secondo Congresso Un. Mat. Ital., Bologna, 1940, Edizioni Cremonense, Rome, 1942, pp. 119–125.

Department of Mathematical Sciences
 State University of New York at Binghamton
 Binghamton, NY 13902-6000
 USA
 email: matt@math.binghamton.edu